

*in 8. 1658*

# THE NULLITY

Of the Prelatique Clergy, and  
Church of England

*Further discovered*

In answer to the plaine prevarication, or vaine  
presumption of D. John Bramhall in  
his Booke, intituled

*The Consecration and succession of Protestant  
Bishops justified, &c.*

*E. K.*

A N D

*N. N.*

*That most true story of the first Protestants Bishops Ordination  
at the Nagshead verified: their fabulous Consecration  
at Lambeth with the forgery of Masons Records  
cleerely detected by N. N.*

Non misi eos, & non precepi eis, neque locutus sum ad eos: visionem  
mendacem, & divinationem, & fraudulentiam, & seductionem  
cordis sui, prophetant vobis. Jerem. 14. 14.

*I sent them not, and I commanded them not, neither have I spoken unto  
them; lying vision, and deceitfull guiltines, and seduction of their  
owne hearts they prophetic unto you. Jerem. 14. v. 14.*



Printed at Antwerp, in the year

M. DC. LIX.

# NULLITY

Of the Presbytery Clergy, and  
Church of England

Formerly discovered

In answer to the plain prevarication, or vari-  
ous prevarication of D. John B. in  
his Book, &c. intitled

The Confession and Accession of Protestants  
Bishops, &c.

48-70

A. N. D.

It is now more than forty years since the first Protestant Bishops Ordination  
at the Newmarket, &c. their solemn Confession  
in Lambeth Church, &c. of the Articles &c.  
drawn up by N. N.

It is now more than forty years since the first Protestant Bishops Ordination  
at the Newmarket, &c. their solemn Confession  
in Lambeth Church, &c. of the Articles &c.  
drawn up by N. N.



Printed at Amberg, in the year

M. DC. LXX.



# THE PREFACE

## CONTAINING

*The State of the Controversy, and  
the Summe of the Authors rea-  
sons produced in the Treatise of  
the nature of Catholique faith,  
and Heresy; with some reflexions  
upon D. Bramhalls impertinent  
digressions and expressions.*

I. **I**N the second Chapter of  
a booke printed an. 1657.  
and intituled, *A Treatise of  
the Nature of Catholique  
faith, and Heresy*: Was occasionally  
proved that the English Protestant  
Bishops, were never validly, or in very  
deed ordained. And albeit the proofs  
were so cleere, as to make the nullity  
of their Clergy, and consequently of  
their Church, manifest to the judge-  
ment of any vnpartial disinterested  
Reader; y yet I vvas content to presse

## THE PREFACE

him no further then to an vndemiabable doubt, this being, sufficient for my purpose, because a doubtfull Clergy is to the effect i intended as good as no Clergy; for a doubtfull Clergy makes a doubtfull Church, and a doubtfull Church is no Church, as giving no assurance to Christian faith. The arguments reduced to a brief summe, were as follovveth.

II. First, the Catholique Doctors, as *Stapleton, Harding, Bristow, Reynolds, &c.* in their bookes printed, some but five, or six yeares, some not long after the pretended ordination of *M. Parker* of Canterbury, and his fellowes, (vpon vvhose consecration confessedly depends the prelatique Clergie of England) pressed these very persons frequently, and earnestly, to make good their consecration, to shew hovv, and by vvhom they received episcopal orders; and yet none of them could cleere this point, either by Registers, vvitnesses, or any circumstances; much less ever mentioned the new *Records*, produced by *M. Mason* fifty yeares after, of their consecration.

## THE PREFACE.

at *Lambeth*, by certaine persons pretended to be Bishops; vvhich they, being in their vvits, vvould never have failed to have donne, if there had bin any such thing.

III. Secondly, that these Records, vvher vpon they vvholly rely, are proved to be forged, not only by their not appearing in so vrgent necessity, but also by the manifest incoherence of the Prelatique Authors that writ of the ordination of the foresaid *Parker*, and his fellovvves, vvith reference to the said records; disagreeing in the persons of the Consecrators, and in the time of their consecration. Besides, the admiration of ancient, and learned persons at the first appareance of these newv found vnheard of Registers, and the exception made against them by *Fitzherbert*, an ancient and knowving man and namely those vvho vvhere permitted to have sight of them; but denied after to peruse them vvith leasure, as they requested. Furthermore, if those Records vvere true, hovv could it have bin objected, that the ordination vvvas not only not canonical, but not

## THE PREFACE.

so much as legal, contrary to the very  
lavves of the land; wheras the Records  
make it so precise, and formal in this  
later point, that there vvas no place of  
cavilling. Besides, the falsefying of  
Records is a thing neither hard, nor  
vnheard of, and easily presumed in tho-  
se, that so grossely corrupt Scripture,  
and Fathers, a crime both more abo-  
minable, and more discoverable. Last-  
ly, it is incredible, that *John Stow*  
should have concealed such a solemne  
buisnesse, as *Parkers* consecration at  
*Lambeth*, hapening in is ovvne tyme,  
and having related the consecration of  
Cardinal *Poole*, Predecessor to *Parker*,  
and making it the greatest part of his  
buisnesse, the choosing of Mayors of  
Loudon, the creation of Lords, and  
such kinde of stufte suitable to such a  
vvriter.

IV. Thirdly, that no man of con-  
science, or common sense can imagine,  
that the Catholique Doctores of those  
times, vvho had such care of their sal-  
vation, as to suffer so much as they  
did vpon that account, should vvil-  
fully damne their soules, by obliging  
poster

## THE PREFACE.

posterity vpon misinformation, to reordaine those that had bin validly, or dained before; for, it is a known *Tenet* wherein the Catholique Moralists, though infinite in number in these later ages vnanimously agree, that we can not, without committing a damnable sinne, no more reordaine, then rebaptise; and it is a practise wel knowen, that as many of that Clergy as after their conversion have received orders amongst vs, have bin ordained absolutly, and without any condition, and consequently without any probability of having received orders, I doe not say canonically, but even validly.

V. Fourthly, that although the foresaid persons had bin against all appearance, ordained by true Bishops, yet, to omit the vncertainty of the matter, the forme, or words vsed in the act of consecration, are at least, of a doubtfull sufficiency, and farre from that certainty of which is required in a matter of so great consequence.

VI. Fifthly, by publique Acts both in *Q. Mary*, and Queene *Elisabeths* Reigne, it is plainly discovered, that the

## THE PREFACE.

*Acts and  
monum.  
pag. 1295.*

the pretended Consecrators of *Parker*, and his fellowes, were looked vpon as in very deed no Bishops. For, in an article of *Queenes Maries*, cited by *John Fox* himseife, is declared, that Edward the VI. his Clergy, *were not ordered in very deed.* And even in the Reigne of King *Henry* the 8. after his schisme, there was such neglect, and contempt of consecration, that heretiques without it; plaid the Bishops, as it appears in *Ridley* of London, and *Latimer* of Worcester; who being burnt for heresy in *Queene Maries* time, were degraded only, as Priests, and not as Bishops; the Judge telling *Ridley*, as *Fox* recounts, *they were to degrade him only of Priesthood, for that they did not take him for a Bishop* Now *Q. Elisabeth* supplying, as you shal see hereafter at no large; the inhability not only of the number, but even of the very *State*, per and *Condition* of the ordainors, doth by manifestly declare the defect not only in formality, but reality, and witha her presumption to supply any thing by din her spiritual headship.

VII. Sixtly, Authors of credit have gre  
rela

## THE PREFACE.

related, and persons of judgment, and knowvledge, have generally believed, that the pretended Consecration vvas performed at the *Nagshead* taverne in cheapside, in à manner so cleerly defective in the opinion now vniversally received amongst Prelatique Protestants, that they are ashamed to heare of it, little regarding the different Tenets of their Ancestours, who as much contemned Consecration, and character, as they seeme now to esteeme them, and cared for no more, but for some exterior shew of a cercmony, to amuse the world, and raise them in the vulgar opinion to the degree of Bishops. Amongst other proofes of this story, was produced the credible, and publique testemony of a person of honor, and ingenuity, who declared to the many persons of prime quality, that he perfectly remembred a speech made both by D. *Morton* called Bishop of *Duresme* in Parliament, wherein hee derived that their Episcopal succession from the original byndination at the *Nagshead*. This small scrap D. *Bramhall* snatcheth vp very greedily, as though it were a matter of

B

substan-

## THE PREFACE.

substance, and able to maintaine their  
decaying Episcopacy. He hath obtaine-  
dof *Morton* to disavow the speech, and  
of six others of the same calling, to say,  
they doe not remember it, and withall  
a testimony of the lords, who also con-  
fesse they can not call to memory some  
antecedēt circumstances of that speech  
and hereof makes flourishes, and tri-  
umphs, as if forsooth, he had got the  
victory in the maine point; or as if vpon  
à mistake (if it were such) in so smal,  
and inconsiderable à circumstance, de-  
pended the matter, which is in hand. *fu*  
Have patience a while, you shall see *yo*  
how much you have got by the bargai-  
ne. You shall find there was more rea-  
son to believe it, and publish it, then to  
you are aware of; and that this stirr you of  
have made, and was foreseene you *glin*  
wold make, hath raised the dust in your *ter*  
owne eyes. *oth*

VIII. But I will first cleerly, and *tha*  
briefly refute your exceptions against *ytte*  
my chiefe arguments, and contrary to *test*  
your method, beginne with, and insist  
vpon that which is most material. But *for*  
I can not omit in a word, or two to *pute*  
you



## THE PREFACE

you in mind of some of your many im-  
 pertinent digressions, as farre from the  
 truth, as from the purpose. You frame  
 to your selfe two opponents, as if ey-  
 ther the argument, or you the adver-  
 sary, required a concurrence of endea-  
 vours. You are much mistaken, one  
 hand was more then sufficient, and no  
 more was employed. *You seeme to be* Pag. 4.  
*troubled upon a report* of a foile you re-  
 ceived, vvhich I never knew but by  
 your booke, and I wonder your long  
 experience made you not reflect, that  
 such things might be maliciously told  
 you, therby to sharpen your passion and  
 raise it. For my part, I never conceived  
 you so forward, as to put your selfe in-  
 to any such danger. Methinks a man  
 of your coate should not *blame min-* Pag. 5.  
*troubling the interest of religion with mat-*  
*ters of state*, vnlesse it be, that some  
 other speakes heere by your pen; or  
 that by a secret instinct you vnawares  
 insinuate the hidden mystery of your pro-  
 testant prelacy, vvhich vvas introdu-  
 ced, and maintained in England, not  
 for religion, but reason of state. Some  
 passages you mention, I suppose ra-  
 ther

## THE PREFACE.

ther vpon instigation of others, then  
 your owne inclination, however it had  
 bin more for your credit to have don-  
 ne it vpon better information of the  
 truth and with more connexion to the  
 subject of your booke; for my part,  
 while I followed you wandring out of  
 the way both of truth; and method, a-  
 bout you doe not knowe what impu-  
 ted to me, I was in feare at every step,  
 to meete with the ridiculous story, of let  
 an imaginary Cardinal layd to my char-  
 ge; who hath more affinity with a mat-  
 ter of ordination, then the late Gover-  
 nor of the Lowcountries.

*Pag. 4. in  
 fine.*

*Cardin.  
 Bleho.*

*Pag. 4.*

IX. You, are much *bragging of the che-  
 learning of your Prelatical English Ig-  
 Clergy, and vvill cope vvith our grea-adv-  
 tost Doctōrs, and feare not to make in  
 parallels, and other such fond brava-Ha-  
 dos; vvhich obligeth me to tell you me-  
 against my vvill, vvhat you are not nity  
 vvilling to heare. I vvould gladly lear-  
 knouvv, hovv many Prelatiques have mee-  
 made knovvne to others nations, that  
 that asfter Hæresy came into En-corn-  
 gland, there remained any marke or scat-  
 footstep of Divinity, or Philosophy mar-*

*Pag. 144.  
 c. 216.*

*Vvit-*

## THE PREFACE.

*Withaker*, I grant, vvas not vnskilful  
in matters of controverfy and could  
speake in a language vnderstood by  
the schollers of forraine countries, but he  
speakes far from the principles of pre-  
rt, latique Protestancy, from that vvch  
of is called the Church of England. Was  
a- there ever any amongst you, that de-  
u- served to carry the bookes after *Alen-*  
*ep, sis, Scotus, Bacon*, *Mediavilla*, or *Mid-*  
*ofleton*, *Ocham*, *Holcot*, *Waldensis*,  
ar- and others, not to goe out of our ow-  
at- ne Ilands. It is no wonder yow burnt  
er- their bookes publicuely in the Vniver-  
fity to be rid of so publicke reproa-  
he chers of your ignorance. Some of late  
sh I grant, have contributed much to the  
a- advancement of knowvledge, each one  
ke in their kind, as *Gilbert*, *Verulam*,  
a- *Harvey*; but these vv ere laymen, and  
oumedled not vvith any matter of Divi-  
otnity. What can you allege in point of  
lly learning amongst you, but that which  
vemeerly belongs to memory, and even  
ns, that, patched vp of rotten rags of  
n-corrupted history, and smal shreds of  
or scattered collections, mingled, and  
hymangled, turned inside out, to make

it-

## THE PREFACE.

the ancient Fathers in a fevv obscure  
 vvords, speake contrary to what they  
 have cleerly delivered in vvhole ho-  
 milies, and bookes. If but in this part  
 rather of reading then learning, rather  
 memory then vvit, you had come to  
 any degree of perfection, vvhat need  
 had there bin to have made so much  
 of *Casaubon* for impugning *Baronius*,  
 and in a later ocasion of an other  
 stranger *Salmasius*? And vvhen out of  
 meere shame, one of yours vvvas forced  
 to reply to him that answered *Salma-*  
*sius*, you see vvhat a piece of stufte was  
 vvouen, not only thredbare in point of  
 learning, but stained with so many fou-  
 le *Barbarismes*, and *Solecismes*, that it  
 is a pittie to see, what a sport vvvas ma-  
 de of it by the adversary, and yet the-  
 re is more reason to thinke, that many  
 had concurred to it, then to the booke  
 you vndertake to refute. I expect you  
 should attribute al those grosse faults  
 to *Erratas* of the printer, as you doe  
 the mistake of *Bedford* for *Dover*, and  
 one moneth for an other, or of the  
 Transcriber, as Richard for Iohn in a  
 nother place, to reconcile the contra-  
 dictions

Pag. 175.

Pag. 89.

## THE PREFACE.

redictions of your solemne consecration  
as *Lambeth*. And yet forsooth these  
scrappers of rude indigested rubbish of  
incoherent historical Notes, must be  
set forth in the false disguise of Do-  
ctors of Divinity, vvhom this Epithe-  
te becomes as much, as a Bricklayer,  
or Davvber the name of an Architect.  
I am sure *S. Gregory Nazianzen* a-  
mongst the Fathers, and Plato amongst  
the Philosophers purchased the title of  
Devines at a higher rate, vvith expen-  
se of their labour in higher matters.

X. And it is vvithout doubt vpon  
the diffidence of their learning that  
you spread so broad your skill in *Conge*  
*d'eslires*, *Premunires*, *Actuaries*, No-  
taries, Signet offices, Deane of the Ar-  
ches, Court of Faculties, &c. Where-  
vvith you vvould blind ignorant Rea-  
ders of your booke to a persuation of  
your misterious knowvledge, as either  
you, or your brethren are vsed to doe  
in sermons, and marginal notes, with  
scantlings of Greeke, and Hebrew  
words. You shall find that your *Conge*  
*d'eslires* and *Actuaries* vvill helpe little  
to cleere your Records from plaine for-  
gery

## THE PREFACE.

gery and that you spill your skill to as little purpose, as your Forefathers did their vvine, or *Metheglen*, to get the Welsh Bishop to ordaine them in a Taverne.

XI.

Now vpon hopes to deprive your adversary of credible testimonies, you will needs persuaade him, that it is;  
*Pag. 221.* *against the art oft polemique disputers, to cite Authors* either dead, or vnsworne, or of their owne party. I pray you M. Doctor, in S. Augustins *Polemicks*,  
*Tomo 6.* how much of this precise caution do  
*Ch 7.* you find? Do you thinke that all which Christian Authors relate against Tureks, Jews, Gentils; and Catholiques against *Arians, Macedonians, Manicheans, Eutychians, Nestorians*, claimes no beliefe from a judicious impartial Reader? when they produce witneses dead or vnsworne, or of their owne party. Is there no difference betweene disputing in Schooles, and pleading at the barr, betweene persuauding a sober judicious Reader with the reality of reason, and coherence of circumstances, and the stopping the mouth of a clamourous, froward, litigious

## THE PREFACE.

gious advocate with formalities of law, which you do most indiscreetly presse, being further of from bringing legal proofs then I, or any man that writ of this subject. For my part I am so farr of from peevish jangling obstinacy, that I will not stick to believe an adversary, if I have not special reason to mistrust his vnderstanding, or honesty, or discover much inconsequence, or find better evidence to the contrary. Before I have donne, you shall find vvhy I question your Relators, and Records, and by ocaſion of D. *Mortons* testimony, the Reader, if he have but the light of reason not eclipsed with passion, shall need neyther schoole, nor law learning to see, how litle credit is to be given to protestant Ministers.

XII. You please your selfe much in a poetical fable of the Cretan *Minotau-  
re*, whervpon you make many glosses, and I shall make of it a glasse for you to represent to your eyes the beautiful figure of your Prelatique Clergy; the cause of both was a very unlawfull lust, in *Henry* the 8. King of England, and *Pasiphae* Queene of Creete; the

Pag. I. &  
134. &  
passim.

C

Mino-

## THE PREFACE.

Minotaure was halfe beast, halfe man;  
and your Clergy, halfe Zuinglian, halfe  
Catholique; both kept in a labyrinth,  
both fed with innocent blood, and  
both at length destroyed by the sword.

XIII. You pretend to shew wit in  
applying this fable to the relation of  
your Clergys descent from the *Nag-  
shead*, which you might better have  
called a tale of a tun, then a tub, as mo-  
re relating to a Taverne; vnlesse it be,  
because your Taverne-Prelates came  
at length to give place to *Tubpreachers*.  
This is only to give you an Item, rather  
te shevv your selfe wary then witty;  
as being more sutable to your age, and  
profitable to your cause. But I can not  
perceive how you were eyther wary, or  
witty, in vpbraiding men of my coate  
with the ill successe of Princes that fol-  
low their counsel, after such, and so  
fresh an example, which never happed  
since God created the vworld, by  
the counsel of any Clergy but yours.  
You say it is pittie I vvas not of his  
Council, I am sure it is pittie that ever  
any Prince, or state, should here after  
be led by the advise of your Clergy, un-  
lesse



## THE PREFACE.

lesse they deserve the like successe.

XIV. But this fond vindication of your forged Records must be decked with more pedantical stuffe of Poetical fables. The Nagshead true story you metamorphose into *an imaginary Chimera* and *M. Mason was the Bellerophon that destroyed this monster*, this *Posthumus brat* was the *Minerva*, or *Issue of M. Neales brain*, or *some others who fathered this rapping lie upon him*. If a chimera be composed of contradictions, what can be more chimerical, then your solemn consecration at Lambeth that contradicts not onely the constant tradition of wise and conscienable men, but the very statutes of the Prince, the acts of Parliament, the doctriener of Protestants, and even the Protestant Creed contrived in those times. This is no Minerva, no issue of any braine but an abortive reeling Bacchus hatched far fró the braine, a Vulcan ridiculously halting at every step. Your Bellerophon with his Pegasus, or poetical Nagshoofe hath only opened a fountaine of fictions when he published his feigned Records, but the Nags-

pag. 146.

## THE PREFACE.

head relation hath made such a breach in your Prelatic Church, that all your Heads put together will never stop it.

XV. You are not content to make ostentation of your wit, but are pleased also to shew your judgement in taxing vs of imprudence, because forsooth, with indiscreete zeale *we endeavour to make Profelites, and follow those birds with noise, and clamour, which vve desire to catch.* Many sinners are so fast a sleepe in their wickednesse, and heresy, that they will not heare ordinary admonitions; to such God commands his preachers, *crie, and cease not, as a trumpet exalt thy voice, and tell my people their vvicked doings.* But why you should compare your protestants to birds, I know not, vnlesse it be, because you have caged them vp in ignorance, or frightened them with skar-crowes of Idols, superstitions, superstructures from flocking to the field of the true Church. Christ called his Apostles rather fishers thē fowlers, and it is the practise of fishers to dash in the water thereby to drive the fish to their nets, and I suppose you have

pag. 216.

vs. 53. 1.

## THE PREFACE.

have observed no such vehemēcy that surpasses the invectives of Christ against the Scribes and Pharisees misleaders of the birds he desired to catch. But those he catcheth, he maketh them silent like fishes, not prating like parrots out of Scripture they know not what, nor chattering together like different birds in a bush, every one in a several note, as those doe, who are caught, and taught by Protestant, not fishers, but fowlers: vnlesse it be in troubled waters. You would doe vvel hereafter to reflect before hand, that what you would say, have the ground of common sense, before you worke it, and trim it into quaint sentēces which in this particular you forgot; for the noyse is not vsed (if any be vsed) to fright away the game, but those that would make an injust prey of it, and hinder it from falling into better hands.

XVI. You thinke I have forgotten Epictetus his rule, *Remēber to distrust.* Pag. 24. But you vvil find me not much guilty of that forgetfulnes, vvhē you see how often I put the Reader in mind, and vpon what grounds, not to trust the alle-


## THE PREFACE.

allegations, and attestations of Protestant Ministers. But that I should rather distrust the perfect remembrance testified vpon oath of a person, both of vnderstanding, and honour ( that neyther would for any interest forswear himselfe, nor could have any interest in so doing ) then a negative testimony of men not remembring eyther vpon absence, or inadvertence, or distance of time, I can not find eyther in the text of Epictetus, nor in the commentary of your grammatical Champion Salmasius any such rule. Had I taken for vvitnes à man that takes Religion vpon interest, and makes it his profession to advance his ovvne, and other mens interest by cheating Policy, or foolish knavery, then you had done a deed of Christian Charity by teaching me this lesson of your Stoical Philosophy.

CHAP-

# C H A P. I.

## *My first and second reason defended against the Doctors objections.*

I.  O the first argument, deduced from the authority of our Catholique Doctors, charging in their printed bookes your first superintendents vvith; vvant of Episcopal consecration, some five or six yeares after you pretend it vvas so solemnly performed at *Lambeth*, you give no other ansvver; Pag. 167. but that *you regard not their judgment, and authority, beause they give no cause, or reason of their Knowvledge.* I pray, M.<sup>r</sup> Doctor, vvhat greater cause of Knowvledge can ther be of the *not being* of a visible, and publicque solemnity, then the not being seene, or heard of by knowing parsons, vvho made it their busines to inquire after it, in the very same time, and place vvherin its pretended to have bin acted? To say that D. *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Bristow*, *Reynolds*, and others; should object in print against your protestant Bishops, vvant of ordination, vvithout inquiring, and examining vvwhether they vvwere ordained or no, is in equivalent termes, to call them *fooles*, and *Knaves*, howver *averse you pretend to be from so unma-* Pag. 207. *nerly language*; your attributing the obiections of these great Doctors to *credulity*, and *preiudice*, doth rather increase, then diminish the  
inju-

## 2 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

jury, for, you ought to know, that *credulity* contradicted by publique and obvious evidence; is of the grosser sort of foolery, and *prejudice* that makes men slight such evidence, is the most *malicious knavery*: neither of both can be layd to the charge of so learned, and honest persons, as the foresaid Doctors, who would never presse *Parker*, and his fellowes, to shew the register, and how, and by whom, they received *Episcopal Orders*, if there had bin in those days as publique, and authentique registers, as now yee pretend.

2. To this you say, that none of our Doctors did ever urge any such thing, as required that yee should cite the registers, in prudence. And that there was no pressing to produce Registers. What then? Doe not men in a suite of law produce what is for their manifest advantage of their owne accord? I am sure you bring many things, you thinke advantagious, which neyther any person, nor reason pressed you to doe. But that they were pressed immediately after, you may learne out of *D. Harding*.

*Confut. apol. fol. 57. & 59. edit an. 1566.* We say likewise to you *M. r Iewel*, and to each of your companions, shew us the register of your Bishops, &c. Shew us the letters of your orders. But order you have not: for, who could give that to you of all these new Ministers, how soever else you call them, which he hath not himselfe. Yet I must confesse it was prudence in your first Bishops, not to cite the registers, though *D. Harding* called for them; because it was better, by their silence, to acknowledge, the want

*Clergy, of England.* 3

of registers, then to prove themselves impostors, by producing them in a time, wherein their forgery had bin discovered by thousands of witnesses in case they were forged then, and not afterwards, when ordination was growne into more credit. And as I commend the prudent silence of your first Bishops, so I must condemne your silly answer in averring, that the registers or records, *wvere cited in print, and alleaged by the Parliament in the publique lawes of the Kingdome*, of which our Doctors, that desired to see some evidence of Parkers consecration, could pleade no ignorance: whereas it is notorious that the act of Parliament 8. Eliz. which as yow pretend (but without any grovvnd, as shall be proved here after) makes mention of the records of *Parkers* consecration at *Lambeth*, vvas made at least à yeare after your Register was called for and our Doctors had objected to your Bishops the nullity, and illegality, of their ordination; and the booke of the 70. Archbishops of Canterbury was printed 1572. seven yeares after that D. *Harding* had called for the same Register, and Letters of their Orders. Though he was a wise man, I hope he might pleade ignorance of what then vvas not as much as thought of, vwhen he vvrit, nor indeed ever after by any, but your selfe; vvho confounds the records of Kings, and Queens letters patents, vvith the registers of the Archbishops of Canterbury.

3. Another reason against the pretended consecration of your first protestant superintendents

D

dents

pag. 112.

#### 4 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

dents, vvas , the contradictions of your ovvne Authors vpon this subject, disagreeing in the persons of the consecraters, and in the time of their consecrations. These contradictions you call *innocent mistakes* , and thinke to excuse them by the retractation of the Authors , who desired that they might be corrected by Mr. *Masons* newfound registers , which you compare to the sun diall , wherby all clockes , and Clerks must be regulated , when the sun shineth out. It scemes Mr Doctor, that the sun never shined vpon your church, vntill Mr *Masons* tecords were printed, for if it had, Mr *Goduin*, Mr *Smcliffe*, and Mr *Butler*, three of the most famous Clerks amongst you , infallibly vvould have consulted the sundial ; and their judgements, and bookes concerning your consecrations , had not bin so different. How comes this sun to be more then fifty yeares vnder a cloud, if it vvas not , that your new registers might participate in some measure , of theould invisibility, of your Church ? Doe yow imagine, that learned, and sober men, would venture to write, and publish to the world a matter of such importance , as the consecration of your first Bishops, vvithout consulting the registers therof if any such had bin exstant, or visible when they vnder-tooke the worke ? were they paradventure ignorant of the place where this sun did shine ? Or were they negligent in setting their clocks to it ? Nheiter can be presumed of so eminent persons as you make them. But your comparison

Pag. 176.  
177. &  
178.



son of *Masons* records to the sun, or fundial, is very improper; for, if the suns motion were as irregular, as those registers are incoherent, the sun would be as unfit for a measure of time, as those are for a prooffe of truth. But if one should mistake for the sun a false Meteor, called a *Parhelion*, and set his clock by the light of a cloud, he would guide the towne, as you do your Church: and men of understanding would be as litle regulated by such a dial, or clock, as *Fitzherbert* was perswaded by *Masons* registers at their first appearance, who suspected them of forgery by the lateness of their discovery as you may see in his booke of *D. Andreus absurdities, falsities, lyes, &c.*

4. But you regard not *Mr Fitzherberts* suspicions at all. What are the suspicions of a private stranger, to the well known credit of a publique register? If you *Mr Doctor*, had not bin a stranger to such pious and learned bookes as *Policy and Religion*, and others composed by *F. Fitzherbert*, and had informed your selfe how long he lived, you would not have spoken so strangely, and ignorantly, of his Knowledge in his owne countreys affairs, nor so contemptibly of his discovery, of *Andreus absurdities*. But you say his suspicions can weigh no more then his reasons, that is, just nothing. Doth it weigh nothing in your judgement, that this register should be called for so frequently, and earnestly in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeths* reigne, when some evidence was desired by the Catholique Doctors of your first Bishops

Pag. 153.

## 6 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

consecration; and that neither it selfe should be cited, nor any other authentically proove thereof produced by *Parker; Ievvel* or any of the rest; and that after fifty yeares it should appeare, when none called for it, and they were dead, whom it most imported, and the time of your Protestant Prelatique Church was more then halfe expired? do you call this obscure, and forged scroll, a well known, and publicque register? I am confident, that in any prudential balance, the suspicion, and reasons of *Fitzherbert* will weigh more then your judgement; and that every one who reads his discovery of *Andrews absurdities*, will confess, that he hath layd him not only in the dust, (as you vainely brag *Andrews* hath donne to our greatest Champions) but also hath buried him in the dirt of his own lyes, the fittest monument for so notorious an Impostor. I shall in the end stir vp in the reader a curiosity to examine *Andrewes* impostures by what I shall note out of *Morton* and others.

Pag. 159.

V. Yet we need not any discoverer of yours but your selfe, you tell vs that the imprisoned Priests, and Iesuits viewed your register, turned it over and over, perused it as much as they pleased, and in conclusion gave this sentence of it, that the booke was beyond exception. If they perused it as much as they pleased, why do you acknowledge, that afterwards they desired to peruse it more fully, and that their request was not granted? Wat a silly excuse you bring for not permitting them to see the register againe, that

Pag. 130.

ould that forsooth such *Records may not goe out of the*  
 ofe *presence of the Keeper?* Why could not the Kee-  
 the per goe along with the Records, or the Fathers  
 ap- come with their Keepers to the Registri? Ceer-  
 ere tainely there was lesse difficulty, then in F. Ol-  
 me cornes perusing the records, who was fur-  
 no- therof as being prisoner in Worcester. Whom *Pag. 128.*  
 cu- you make also an approver of the same re-  
 bli- cords vpon your owne bare assertion. And yet  
 ru- forsooth, Polemique writers must cite no wit-  
 s of nes of their owne party, though you be so bould  
 ge- as to cite your selfe. But it is more then bould-  
 sco- nes to bring in Mylord of Calcedon as confes- *Pag. 129.*  
 hat sing it, whereas he onely lets it passe vpon  
 you your word, not granting it so, as having any  
 our knowvledge of it from another hand, but in  
 him case it were so as you say, that it maketh not  
 nu- much to your purpose. But the truth is, the im-  
 l in prisoned Iesuits did never allovv your Re-  
 xa- cords, as those yet living, and then living in  
 no- England (and at least in this matter belonging  
 to their ovvne people may know as much as  
 ours you, or My Lord of Calcedon) wil testify.  
 ned One as being on this side the sea, I may name  
 ned to you without danger, and stop your mouth  
 lea- alwayes crying against nameles witnessess. It  
 that is the R. F. *Henry More* novv Rector of the Se-  
 sed minary of S. Omers, whose word in any mat-  
 ch- ter of fact will be taken, as soone as yours,  
 to even by the persons of your owne party, and  
 was sooner in this particular, as having more rea-  
 son to know it. What if *M. Wadsworth* say he  
 ne, read *Paockers* consecration in the registers,  
 hat doth

8 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*  
doth that make your registers good against so many signes of forgery. Nay put the case he, and some few should have bin something moved at the sight of them, it argues no more then their ignorance of the manifold arguments I bring to convince them of fallood. As for your other witnessses I must take them vpon your word, which I have found so palpably faile in the former, and shall take occasion in another chapter to examine them, and what you say of them.

---

C H A: P. II.

*The fabulous Consecration at Lambeth, and the forgery of its records proved by the Statute 8. Eliz. I. and by the Queenes letters patents, and Commission.*

- I. **B** Vt if your Register be not forged, and all was so legally performed at *Lambeth*, as it relates, vvhy should our Doctors object to your first Bishops, not only nullity, but also illegality of consecration, contrary to the statutes, and lawes of the land? Why did the Queene make good by act of Parliament, not only the forme of Ed. 6. ordination, *But also all Actes, and things had, made, or donne by any person, or persons. in or about any consecration, confirmation, or investing of any person, or persons elected to the office, or dignity of Archbis-*
8. Eliz. 1.

## Clergy, of England.

9

Archbishops, or Bishops by vertue of the *Queenes* letters patents, or commission, sithence the beginning of her reigne? If Parker and the rest had bin consecrated according to the forme of Edward 6. as your Records, and Writers pretend, what need had there bin of this Act of Parliament? This is so cleere against your forged Registers, and feigned solemnity at Lambeth, that you thought fit to omit in your answer to this objection, the words of the statute; and only say, *that I repeate, the vvords of a part of the statute, and thence conclude, by which act appeares, that not only King Edwards rite, but any other used since the beginning of the Queenes reigne, vpon her commission, vvvas enacted for good, and consequently that of the Nagshead might passe.* Cujus contrarium verum est. The contrary to what these Fathers inferre, doth follow necessari-ly from these vvords, vvwhich the Fathers cite. The vvords of the Act are these, *By vertue of the Queenes letters patents, or Commission.* I pray Mr Doctor, have a better opinion of your Readers, then to thinke they are so mad, as to be per- swaded by you, that men should, cite only the words of a statute, *By vertue of the Queenes letters patents, or Commission*, to prove the nul- lity, or illegality of your protestant consecra- tion. Is it the manner, I do not say of Pole- nick, but even of honest Writers, to concea- le, and mangle the words wherupon the Ad- versary grounds the force of his argument.

2. But yow are as unfortunate in citing these few words *By vertue of the Queenes letters patents,*

Pag. 146.

Ch. 147.

# 10 The Nullity of the Prelatique

patents, or Comission, as your Reader must be  
 unsatisfied of your ingenuity, for concealing  
 the others to wch they relate. The Queenes  
 letters patents which yow cite, declare expres-  
 sly, that the reason why by her supreme au-  
 thority, she dispensed with all invalidities of  
 the persons *condition, state, and faculty*, and with  
 all illegalities against the Canons of the  
 Church, and statutes of the land, was not  
 her *Majesties extraordinary care, least some cir-*  
*cumstance in the politicall part might be defective*

in some *punctilio of law* as yow pretend; but an  
*extreme necessity*; that is, the want of as much  
 as one true Bishop, to consecrate the rest; and  
 therfore she dispensed not only with censu-  
 res, and penalties, as the Pope doth in his

Bulls; but also with the *condition, and state* of  
 the Consecraters, who being only simple  
 Priests, and not Bishops, were by the Quee-  
 nes commission, and supremacy, exalted, and  
 enobled to conferre episcopal orders. The  
 words of the Queens letters patents are. *Sup-*  
*plentes nihilominus supremâ nostrâ autoritate re-*  
*giâ, &c. Si quid aut in his quæ juxta mandatum*  
*nostrum per vos fieri, aut in vobis, aut vestrum*  
*aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate, vestris, ad præ-*  
*missa perficienda desit, aut deerit eorum, quæ per*  
*statuta hujus Regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiæ*  
*veritas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessariâ sunt*  
*temporis ratione, & rerum necessitate id postulante.*  
*In cujus rei, &c. Teste Regina, &c.*

3. This part of the Queens letters patent  
 you translate into English thus, supplying many

on exc

## Clergy, of England.

II

*our Souveraigne authority all defects either in the Executors of this Commission, or any of them. Its strange you ever made mention of a Commission so evidently contrary to your principles, and to the cause you undertake to maintaine, that you dare not translate it faithfully. But I vvill supply your defect in this particular, Supplying by our Souveraigne Royal authority, &c. If any thing be, or shall be wanting in these things vvhich yee are to do by our command, either in your selves, or in any of you, or in your condition, state, faculty, vvhich by the statute of this our Kingdome, or by the lawes of the Church are required, or necessary, the time, and necessity of affaires exacting this, &c. You make this dispensation a superfluous clause, or at most a salve to help a latent impediment; but the Queene, and the commission it selfe declare, that it vvvas a necessary remedy to enable the condition, and state of the consecraters, who were no Bishops.*

4. Yet you are confident that the only ground of this monstrous dispensation, vvvas the same exception vvhich Bishop Bonner did afterwards make against the legality of Hornes consecration; vvhich is all (say you) that Stapleton, or any of your adversaires had to pretend, or except against the legality of the ordination of the first protestant Bishops There is as litle reason to doubt of your confidence, as there is for you to be so confident. Did either B. Bonner, D. Stapleton, or any other of your adversaries, mention that exception vvhich you father vpon them?

Pag. 94.  
& 95.

E

They

## 12 *The Nullity, of the Prelatique*

They were not so ignorant in the lawes, and statutes of England, as you would make them, and all other Writers besides your selfe. It had bin, not onely confidence, but impudence to object illegality of ordination contrary to the lawes of England, if your first Bishops had bin ordained according to the lawes, forme and of Edward VI. and so solemnly at *Lambeth*, as your forged Registers pretend. *Bonnors* exception was, that *Herne* was no Bishop, and *Stapletons* words are. *You (Horne)* are without any consecration at all of your *consecration* Metropolitan, (*Parker*) himselfe poore man being no Bishop neither. Is it not notorious that yee, and your *Collegues* were not ordained according to the *ancient* prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even at *the very statuts*? These words can have no relation to the doubt you move (but our *Authors* never toucht) concerning your booke of ordination being, or not being restored by *this Act of Parliament* 1. *Elizab.* Therefore *D. Stapletons* words, and exceptions were against some other illegality, to wit, your first Bishops merry ordination at the *Nagshead*, for no other was ever pretended by your Authors, you but either this, or that formal ceremony at *Lambeth*; which if ever it had bin, *D. Stapleton* would not have bin so impudent, as to object notorious illegality against your first consecrations. But you say that his objection, and exception sheweth nothing but this, how apt a drowning cause is to catch hold of every reed; By your leave *M. Doctor*, it also sheweth

Counter.  
bl. fol. 7.  
¶ 9. ¶  
fol. 301.

Page 97.

Page 98.

weth



and weth, how apt a drunken cause is to catch  
 em, hold of every cup; and that your spiritual Fo-  
 It refathers had a plot to make the old Bishop of  
 nce Landaf halfe drunke, that at least in a pleasant  
 y to humor he might lay hands on them; therfore  
 ops they invited him to a Taverne; this is the rea-  
 ves, son *Q. Maries priests did give, vwhy they met at*  
 y at the *Nagshead*, as you may see in the answers  
 nd. to M. Watsvvorhis letters cited by your self.

Pag. 129.  
 in ep. ad  
 ami.

no 5. Yet you desire your Reader to observe, that  
 or this dispensative clause neyther had, nor can be  
 your construed to have any reference to any consecration  
 ing that vvas acted by Scory alone, as that silly conse-  
 and cration at the *Nagshead* is supposed to have bin:  
 the and the same *Dispensative* clause doth not extend  
 ven at all to any essential of ordination: nor to the Ca-  
 nonons of the universal Church; and that the Com-  
 Au-missioners authorised by these letters patents to con-  
 ke firme, and consecrate Parker, did make no use of  
 by this supplentes, or dispensative pouwer in the con-  
 sta-secration, vvhich is a purely spiritual Aët, and  
 inst belongeth meerly to the Key of order. All this you  
 Bis-desire the Reader to observe vvith you, vvith-  
 out giving him any reason, or ground for  
 ors, your observation. Is it the manner of Pole-  
 atnick Writers to beg the controverfy out of  
 ble-meere civility? Readers must be perswaded by  
 ob-reason, and not desired by empty words, to  
 on-give their assent in controverted matters. You  
 and say that the Commissioners, or Consecraters  
 apt of Parker did make no use of the Queens di-  
 very dispensative power in the consecration. But  
 he-themselves say the contrary, (being conscious  
 eth

Pag. 99.  
 & 100.

#### 14. *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

of their owne incapacity to consecrate Bishops, as being only simple Priests, and never consecrated) and declare in their definitive sentence, that they will make vse in the consecration, of the Queenes dispensative povver.

*See this definitive sentence in D. Bramball pag. 101.* Their words are. *Therefore vve the Queens Commissioners (Barlow, Scory, &c) by consent of the Layviers that vve have consulted, do confirme the aforesaid election by the supreme authority of the reuerend Queen, communicated unto vs. Supplying also by the sayd supreme authority vvhatssoever hath bin defective in this election: as also is, or shall be wanting in vs, or any of vs, in our condition, state, faculty, to perfect these things vvhich vve are commanded to doe.* They were commanded not only to confirme Parkers election, but also to tie perfect the worke, and consecrate him; and yet they say that they vwill do so, and do supply the defects of their owne state, and condition, (which could be no other, but the want of episcopall consecration) by the Queens dispensative, and supreme authority. And yet *D. Bramhall* doth desire the Reader out of courtesy, to observe, and thinke the contrary.

6. You talke much of your key of order, which vvas no other, then the key of a celler, elevated by the Queens scepter, and spiritual authority, to be efficient of your first Bishops consecration in a Taverne, which you most ungratefully, and vnwarily reject, when contrary to the statutes you affirme, that neyther she, nor the lawes of England can make an ordination to be valid, or invalid, because

they

*Pag. 60.  
121. 171.  
& 148.*

they can not change the institution of Christ, who determined for the essential matter of ordination, imposition of hands. This is very true, but no protestant doctrine in those times as being contrary to the 25. article of your english Creed, which teacheth, that Christ never appointed any visible signe for Orders, and consequently it is no Sacrament. Therefore if imposition of hands be a visible signe, it can not be (according to the symbol of the English Church) the essential matter of ordination by Christs institution. If you had uttered in your primitive Church the Doctrine, which now you print, you had not only fallen into a *Premunire*, but also incurred the penalties of an Heretique for being so obstinate against your new Creed, and the articles set downe by your first Apostles.

7. It is not to be wondered, that a man so ignorant of his *Creed*, should knowe so little of the law as you do. Read I pray these words of the statute 8. Eliz. 1. referring to an other made the first yeare of her reigne. *And by the same Act, and statute, there is also given to the* 2. *Highnesse, her heirs &c. full power, and authority by letters patents vnder the great seale of England, from time to time, to assigne, name, and appointe such person, or persons, as she, or they shall thinke meete, and convenient, to exercise, use, occupy, and execute vnder her Highnesse, all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, preheminences, and authorities, in any wise touching, or concerning any spiritual, or Ecclesiastical power, or jurisdiction*

16 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*  
*ction vwithinthis Realme , or any other her H. Do-*  
*minions or Countries.* I beseech you M. Doctor,  
answer now directly , and without tergiversa-  
tion might not the Queene by her letters pa-  
tents, without any other ceremony, name and  
authorize, according to this Act of Parliament,  
any Carrier, Carter, or Catchpol , *to exercise ,*  
*vse, occupie, and execute all manner of jurisdictions,*  
*prebeminencies , and authorities , in any vwise tou-*  
*ching , or concerning any spiritual, or ecclesiasticall*  
*povver.* What is episcopacy , or priesthood, but  
a spiritual, and ecclesiastical power? And what  
is ordination, or consecration, but to exercise,  
vse, or execute this spiritual povver , by con-  
ferring it vpon others? Therefore according to  
the statuts of England, the Queene , and her  
heires , and successors . may make Priests, and  
Bishops, vwithout imposition of hands, or any  
other matter, or forme , but their letters pa-  
tents vnder the greate seale of England. Which  
though it be cleere enough by the very words  
of the statute to any one that vnderstands En-  
glish, yet it is made most vdeniably evident,  
by the Protestant *Tenet* of those dayes requi-  
ring no more for Order then Election of  
Prince or people , which *Tenet* appears in  
their writings, in their translations of Scrip-  
ture , and in their Creed, so that the Prince in  
England having assumed full power in point  
of Election, could accordingly dispose, and  
dispense, at will in any thing belonging to Or-  
der. And when any ceremony of consecration  
was vsed they cared not what it was , so it  
might

might serve to amuse the vulgar, not yet introduced to the new Doctrine of Priests, and Bishops not consecrated.

8. This was the power assumed: let vs now see their practise used. They were enforced (sayth D Kellison) to make superintendents, and ministers of our apostating Priests, such as Parker, Grindal, Sands, Horne. &c. who were thought fittest to make such Ministers on, without any other moulding, or kneading. And when they wanted Apostates, who were consecrated after the Catholique manner, they tooke laymen of their owne, of which some were base artificers; and without any other consecration, or ordination then the Princes, or the Superintendents letters (who themselves were no Bishops) they made them Ministers, and Bishops with as few ceremonies, and lesse solemnity, then they make their Aldermen, yea Constables, and Cryers of the Market. And from this stock proceedeth all the rabble of their Ministers, &c. D. Stapleton, whom you call one of the most rational heads our Church had since the separation, gives you this Catalogue of your first protestant Clergy. And when I pray you reesteeth a great part of your new Clergy, but in butchers, cookes, catchpols, and robbers, diers, and dawbers, fellows carrying their marke in their hand instead of a shaven crowne, fishermen, gunners, harpers, inkeepers, merehants, and mariners, neimakers, potters, potycaries, and porters of Belingsgate, pinners, pedlers, ruffing, ruffins, sadlers, sheermen, and sheaperds, tanners, tilers, tinkers, trumpeters, weavers, wherry-men.

Kellison  
survey  
pag. 373.  
& 374.  
edit,  
1603.

Pag. 142

Counter-  
blast lib.  
4. num.  
481 prin-  
ted an.  
1567.

# 18 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*men, &c.* If D. Stapleton was so rational a head, as you are pleased to acknowledge, you have but little reason to brag of the first heads, and members of your schisme, or separation; and much lesse to be angry vvith my lord Brookes, for applying his Coachman to the office of a Protestant Preacher; who by his trade, (not to speake of his talent) might challenge an eminent place amongst your first Ministers, and without disgracing your Church, might head this remarkable, that D. Stapleton hath so particularly described. But speake to the purpose M. Doctor: Doe you perswade your selfe; that all these fellows were ordained by imposition of episcopal hands, and with all that formalitie you bring out of your Pontifical? no truly, they were only ordained by letters patents, or some other me paper of your first Bishops, who practised the same stile with their Ministers, that the Queene did with themselves, and if sometimes vvith ceremony, it vvwas onely for ceremony, not necessity, and consequently with no more formality then might suffice to blind the ignorant.

And truly when I consider the Queens supreme, and spiritual authority, confirmed by the statuts 1. & 8. Eliz. I do not wonder at this, practise of your primitive Church in ordaining any Post, or Carrier they met in the highway, and that legally without any imposition of hands, or Ceremony. The statute doth warrant it by these words. *And further for the avoyding of all ambiguities, and questions that may*

*Bram*  
*Pag. 12.*

8. Eliz. 1.

*might*

## Clergy of England.

19

might bee objected against the lawfull confirmations, investing, and consecrations of the said Archbishops, and Bishops ( that is Parker, and his fellows ) her highnes in her letters patents, under the great seale of England, directed to any Archbishop, Bishop, or others, ( marke the word, others, which comprehendeth laymen, or simple Priests ) for the confirming, investing, and consecrating of any person elected to the office, or dignity of any Archbishop, or Bishop, hath not only used such words, and sentences as were accustomed to be used by the late K. Henry, and K. Edward, her Majesties father, and brother, in their like letters patents, made for such causes: but also hath used, and put in her Majesties said letters patents, divers other general words, and sentences, wherby her Highnes supreme power, and authority, hath dispensed with all causes, or doubts of any imperfection, or disability, that can, or may in any wise be objected against the same as by her Majesties said letters patents remaining of record, more plainly will appear, So that to all those, that will well consider the effect, and true intent of the said lawes, and statutes, and of the supreme, and absolute authority of the Queens Highnes, and which shee by her Majesties said letters patents hath used, and put in there, in, and about the making, and consecrating, and the said Archbishops, and Bishops, it is, and may be very evident, ( D. Bramhall cites these last words without mentioning the former, of which their sense depends ) and apparent that the cause of scruple, ambiguity, or doubt, can, or may justly be objected against the said elections, confirmations,

Pag. 122.

F

firma.

## 20 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*firmations, or consecrations, or any other material thing meete to be used, or had, in, or about the same: but that every thing requisite, and material for that purpose (that is the Queens letters patents, and ample dispensation vnder the great seale of England) hath bin made, and donne as precisely, and with as greate a care, and diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before her Majesties tyme, as the Records of her Majesties sayd Father, and brothers tyme, and also of her owne time, will more plainly testify, and declare. This is a clause indeed that taketh a vway all occasion of Protestant scruples, and doubts, not only of the invalidity, but also of the illegality of your ordination at the Nagshead.*

10. Yet because you would needs have the ordination performed at *Lambeth*, you maintain that these last words, *the Records of her Majesties sayd Fathers, and Brothers time, and also of her owne time, will more plainly testify, and declare*, relate to your forged Registers. And to make good your assertion, you falsify the text egregiously; for, you say, the statute speaketh expressly of *the Records of elections, and confirmations, and consecrations*, and this you put in a distinct character, as if they had bin words of the very statute. Its strange, that where you lay to my charge, falsifying of the text, your selfe should commit the crime so notoriously. In all the statute you can not find any such words, *Records of elections, and confirmations, and Consecrations*: but you will find expressly these words, as by *her Majesties sayd letters pa-*



*ments remaining of record. more plainly will appeare.* If that Gloſſe is accuſed, which corrupteth, and cōtradicteth the text, vvhath ſhall wee ſay of yours? Read with attention the text, and you will be convinced, that *the Records of her Maieſties ſaid Father, and Brothers time, and alſo of her owne time,* relate not to any Records, or Registers of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, nor to the Records of elections, confirmations, and conſecrations; but to the Records of the Kings, and Queenes letters patents; for, the ſtatute ſayth: that every thing requiſite, and material for the taking away all cauſes of ſcruples, doubts, and ambiguities, that might be objected againſt the ſayd elections, and conſecrations, and confirmations, or any other material thing meeete to be vſed, or had in, or about the ſame, had bin made, and done, as preciſely, *or rather more*, then ever before her Maieſties time, *as by the Records of her Maieſties ſaid Father, and Brothers time, and alſo of her owne,* vwill more plainely appeare. The words, *or rather more* preciſely, and with more care, and diligence, can not relate to Parker, and his Camerades conſecration though we ſhould grant, it was performed at Lambeth with a read cloth on the floore, and tapeſtry on the eaſt ſide; for, I hope, in Catholique times they were as preciſe, diligent, and decent in conſecrations, as in Q Elizabeths, (though they vſed not a read cloth vpon à Sunday of Advent, as your Register ſayes yee did vpon the 17. of December 15;9.) eſpecially

## 22 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

Pag. 92.

ly seing your selfe doth confesse, *Coverdales syde wollen gowne, which he vsed at Parkers consecration, was uncanonicall, and needed a dispensation.* Now is there, or ever vvas a more exact Pontifical prescribing all things of necessity, and excluding all ambiguity then that, which is vsed in these later ages by the Church of Rome.

The said words therfore of the statute relate only to the Records of the Queenes letters patents; for by the said records it may cleerly appeare, that her Majesty did not only vse such words, and sentences as were accustomed to be vsed by her Father, and Brother in their like letters patents made for such causes, but also hath vsed, and put in her said letters patents, diuers other general words, and sentences, wherby her H. by her supreme povver, and Authority did dispense with all causes, or doubts of any imperfection, or disability that might be objected, even against the Consecraters *state, or condition.* This indeed is more precise, and more particularly expressed, and with greater care and diligence, then ever before her time had bin donne by King of England, or Pope of Rome. But what relation can these words have to *Cranmers Registers*? To what purpose should they be confounded with the Records of her Majesties Father, and Brothers time, and her owne? The words *rather more* can not allude to any Records but those of the Queenes letters patents; they have destroyed the Doctors plea, and deprived

his

his forged Registers, and booke, of all the credit which he pretended for them by this Act of Parliament. 8. Eliz. 1. This exorbitant jurisdiction assumed by your she Pope in so essential points of spiritual Sovereignty over your Church, and declared by her ample vnderheard of dispensations, doth discover the very fundation of your Orders, and the rocke vpon vvhich your Church is built. I am sure S. Paul is far from exalting a woeman to such a degree of povver in Church affaires, and we deprive her of all spiritual jurisdiction, and our most judicious and learned Moralists even of power to command vnder precept of obedience the Religious woemen of a Monastery whereof she is lavvfully made superiour, she is onely Materfamilias of one community, and your statutes make a woeman spiritual Sovereigne of a Monarchy. The vvords of the statute, and the ansverable practise are to cleere to admit your Moderne paraphrase.



## 24 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

### C H A P. III.

*The Protestants Consecration at Lambeth is proved to be a fable, and their Register to be forged, by their falsifications of Scripture, and by the 25. of their 39. articles; and D. Bramhals arguments to maintaine the contrary, are retorted against himselfe.*

**N**OT withstanding all this, the Doctor sayes, it is incredible that the Registers of the first Protestant

*Pag. 106.* Bishops consecration should be forged. And why so M Doctor? Is it incredible that they who falsify Scripture, should forge Records? And howv notoriously your first Bishops have falsified Scripture, is demonstrated by *D. Gregory Martin* in a learned booke, intituled *A Discovery of the manifold corruptions, &c.* You

*Pag. 201.* give fover ansvvers to this argument 1. you desire good words. And I desire a better ansvver. 2. That *Gregory Martin* is an adversary, whose censure you do not esteeme a button. I desire you once more M. Doctor to answer, and speake to the purpose. Though you do not weigh *D. Martins* censure, ansvver his reasons, and the examples he brings: confute his booke, and demonstrations. Your third ansvver is, *I hope none of us did ever attempt to purge S. Pauls Epistles, because there were in them some things that sounded not well in point of justification.* I vnder-

der-

derstand not to what, or to whom do you allude by this answer. But I am sure, your Protopatriarche Luther to make good his justification by faith alone in his Dutch translation inserted the word *alone* into the very text, against all originals, or copies, or versions that ever had bin seene before. Fourthly you answer. *Rather then be accounted falsifiers of Scripture, vve are content to stand to the vulgar Latin in any controversy between them and vs.* Is this to solve an argument? Are your Protestant readers satisfied with such stuffe? stay sir, I must in the name of convincing logique arrest your shifting Rhethorique. This was the argument. Those that have grossely falsified Scripture, may easily be presumed to have falsified records, especially when the records vpon other circumstances are deeply suspected, but the first hath bin the frequent vse of English Protestant Ministers, *ergo* you should have proved at least in som general termes, that your English translations were not corrupted: you should have called them *innocent mistakes*, or *Erratas of the print*, as *Dover* for *Bedford*, which you thought sufficient to serve your turn at least in another occasiō. If one were accused, and pressed by sundry proofes to have killed his Brother, and it should be further vrged, that notwithstanding the crime was enormous, and not easily to be beleeeved in other persons, yet in him it might justly be presumed, by reason of the knowne publique evidences, whereby he had bin plainely convicted

## 26 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

cted to have killed his father. Must this be slept over? Would this availe nothing? Can the artificial Rhetorique of a slighting pretermis-  
 sion, so stupify the natural logique of every one that is come to the vse of reason, as not to see the force of this conclusion? He hath killed his father, what vvonder is it if he kill his brother? They falsify Scripture what marvel if they forge records. Hath your custome of vrging light conjectures against the Church of Rome so destroyed the nature of reason in you, as not to feele your selfe, or to thinke that others doe not feele the weight of an argument *à fortiori*? Records are humane, Scripture divine, Records are kept in a corner, Scripture exposed to the vew of all, Records have fevv copies, and kept by a few; and those of one faction. The Christian vvorld is full of Bibles. Is it not then lesse against conscience, of easier contrivence, and further from danger of a shamefull discovery, to forge records, then to falsify Scripture. This is onely to stop you a while from posting with so much speed from this passage. In the end of the booke I shal detaine you longer, and hould you faster, and put a rub to the sliding eloquence you have learned in Holland. If you vvil not, yet the Reader shall see by vvhat I shal lay clearly before his eyes, and shal remit to the judgement of his owne eyes, if he be pleased to view, and cōfer him selfe what I shal set downe of some, and direct him to seeke of other Protestant Ministers, in point of grosse, wil-  
 full

full, malicious, and impudent falsifications of Scripture, and Authours, whereby he will conclude with himselfe how far he shal thinke fit to give credit hereafter to their sayings, or writings, and namely, and particularly D. Morton called B. of Duresme, that Minister of *simple truth*, as he called himselfe in those very bookes which seeme to have bin dictated by the father of lyes, and now in his late testimony is not ashamed to speake thus. *I could never have made such a speech* (marke the prooffe he adjoyneth) *seeing I have ever spoken according to my thoughts*. He may very well have forgot what he once spoke in Parliament seeing he hath forgot what he hath so often writ against his thoughts, and cleer knowledge in several bookes. But of this mans false writings hereafter, now I returne to your false records, being you are resolved to *convince all those who gainsay them* by six doughty arguments, which I hope to retort against you, and by your owne grounds prove the contrary of what you are confident to maintaine. Pag. 15.

3. Your first argument is, that value, and respect which the lawes of England do give the Registers. The lawes of England were so farre from valuing, or respecting these Registers, that they did not as much as cite, or mention them, when *Parker*, and his Colleagues were pressed to shew the letters of their Orders, being accused by our Catholique Doctors that they had never bin ordained. And the Parliament 8. Pag. 107.

28 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

Eliz. thought it more for the credit of their protestant Church, and Clergy, to make them Bishops by a statute, then examine the matter, which resolution had never bin taken, if any witnesses, or Records of their consecration at *Lambeth* could have bin produced in the 8. year of Q. Elizabeths reigne. But what marvelle is it, that the lawes of England should not value your Records, when your first superintendents themselves never durst send D. Harding, or any of the rest who desired it, an authenticke Copie of them out of your Registry? Or so much as make mention of the original.

4. Your second argument is taken from the credit of the foure publique Notaries, who did testify Parkers individual consecration at *Lambeth*, it being observable that these four Notaries were the same who did draw Cardinal *Pooles* consecration into Acts, and attest them. This prooffe, and observation weighs as litle, as foure publique Notaries conscience, and credit, who in Cardinal *Pooles* time professed one faith, and in *Parkers* an other. Men that counterfeit religions, will have no difficulty te counterfeit Registers, if they be commanded, or inclined to do it; neither would their testimony, be of vndoubted credit in any place of the world, if contradicted by so many arguments, and circumstances as your pretended consecration at *Lambeth*. But in case these Notaries had bin persons beyond any all exception, might not their hands be counterfeited.



their interfeited as well as the Register? What greater difficulty can there be in one more then in the other? Its a silly argument that involves in it selfe the same difficulty it ought to cleere. Your third and fourth ground of the Queens Commission, and of the Act of Parliament 8. Eliz. have bin answered in the former Chapter, and are evident proofes, that your Records are forged.

5. Your fifth ground is taken from a booke *Pag. 115.*  
*you say vvas printed an. 1572. of the lives of 70. & 116.*  
*succeeding Archbishops of Canterbury, vvhetherin*  
*the Author (that vvas Archbishop Parker him-*  
*selfe) having described the Confirmations, and*  
*the Consecrations of his fellowves, he addeih in the mar-*  
*gient. These confirmations, and consecrations do*  
*appeare in the Registers. It seemes you learnt*  
*from Parker to cite your selfe as a vvitnessse*  
*for your selfe. Is this the manner of Polemick*  
*Writers? But why did not Parker, or Iewel,*  
*remit D. Harding to these Registers, wherof*  
*M. Parker some seaven yeares after made (if*  
*me vve believe you) marginal notes; when he so*  
*earnestly called for them, shew vs your Regi*  
*sters, in the yeare 1566. Then vvas the time*  
*before Parker, and the rest to cite them, and not*  
*in the yeare 1572. Yet D. Champney doubts*  
*whether any such booke vvas printed of your*  
*Archbishops as you pretend. Whether it was,*  
*as or no, it matters not, for the Registers cited*  
*but in the margent by Parker, mentioneth not*  
*any place, or forme of their consecrations,*  
*and is as indifferent for the Nagshead Taver-*  
*ne.*

### 30 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

ne, as for the Chapell of *Lambeth*, as you may see in the booke called *Antiquitates Britannia* edit. 1605. into which this forged Register was foisted, being a meere novelty, and therefore contrary to the drift, and title of the booke, without connexion to what goeth before, or followeth after.

Pag. 164. ¶ 6. But how comes it to passe M. Doctor, that in this booke, and Register, are set downe, as you say, the names of your Bishops, their Countries, their Armes both of their sees and families, their respective ages, their universities, their degrees in Schooles, vvith the times (but not the place) of their severall consecrations? How comes it to passe I say, there should be roome for all these things, and none at all for *Lambeth*, which takes vp no more then *Ipsvvich*, Parkers Countrey, or *Cambridge*, his vniversity? Is it more material to put in a Register, the place of a Bishops nativity, or education, then the place where he received his character, or consecration? Did he esteeme more the degree of a Doctor, then the dignity of a Bishop? I could not exact, nor expect from M. Parker, that he should assure vs in his Register, whether the Chapell of *Lambeth* vv as adorned with tapestry on the east, or west side, as *Mason* doth; but me thinks his Lordship might have remembered on which side the *Thames* stands *Lambeth*, if it had bin the place of his consecration.

Pag. 164. ¶ 7. It is hardly possible for the vv it of man, saith the Doctor, to contrive more matter into a lesser roome.

*roome*- My complaint is, that so much superfluous matter was thrust in, and that which imported most, (to wit the place of your first Bishops consecration) omitted. I confesse M. Doctor, you have as much reason to commend in this case, Parkers wit for not mentioning *Lambeth*, as in an other you had to commend *Jervels* prudence, for not answering *Harding* when he pressed him to shew the Registers of his Bishops, and their letters of Orders. For, if M. *Parker* had but named *Lambeth* as the place of his consecration, the forgery of his Records had bin as manifest to as many as then remembred the 17. of December 1559. and never heard of any solemnity at *Lambeth* on that day: But though I commend M. *Parkers* wit in concealing the place of his consecration, yet I must condemne your judgement, good M. *Bramhall*, for citing a Register so disadvantageous to your cause.

8. Your 6. and last ground destroyes the five former, *because it is taken from the agreement,* Pag. 116.  
*and concurrence of your civil Records vvith your ecclesiastical Registers.* There can not be greater disagreement, and opposition then there is betweene the Queenes commission, or letters patents, the Act of Parliament 8, Elizab. and your Registers. These Registers suppose, and declare, ther was no need of a dispensation, the letters patents, and Act of Parliament declare, there vv as a necessity to dispense vvith defects, and disabilities. Your Registers suppose that the consecraters vv ere true Bishops;

### 32 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

The Queens Commission suppose they vyere not, becanse she dispenseth vvith defects of the consecraters *state*, and *condition*, vvich defects could be no other, then vvant of episcopal consecration. Your Registers suppose that foure Bishops did consecrate; but the Acts of Parliament do suppose, that one person might do it, and that one did it, and therefore makes good whatsoever any *person*, or *persons* did about *the consecration of any Archbishop, and Bishop sithence the beginning of the Queens reigne*. Your Registers suppose that Bishops mult be consecrated by imposition of hands; but the Acts of Parliament 1. & 8. Elizabeth. And also your 25. article of the 39. suppose that Bishops are consecrated by election, or by the Queens letters patents, or commission; and consequently might say that your first Bishops vvere orderly consecrated, and according to the lawes of the land, though they had no imposition of hands; yet to take avvay all protestant scruples, there vvvas an ample povver, and dispensation more particularly expressed in the Queens commission to the consecrators, then ever vvvas seene or heard of before her Majesties Reigne. Many other disagreements might be set dovvn, but these may suffice to shew, how impossible it is for you, or any other, to reconcile plaine contradictions by improbable fictions, or impostures.

## C H A P I V.

*The fabulous consecration at Lambeth, and the protestant Registers disproved by John Stow; and by the Catholique Tenet of not reordaining, and by the authority of our Writers.*

I. Produced Iohn Stovves silence of your solemnity, and consecration at *Lambeth*, as an argument, that never any such thing had bin, as your Registers pretend. For, how could a man that made it his buisnesse to relate, and describe the solemnities, and casualties of his time, especially hapening in, and about London, conceale so notorious, and rare a solemnity, as the first protestant consecration of an Archbishop of Canterbury? To this you answer in rime, *that my store is very low, when I am forced to produce Iohn Stovv.* The rime is pteety, and in the *Nagshead* Taverne may be sung to the tune of *Iohn Derry, or Dorrone Derry*, but it is rime vvithout reason: for all the reason you give, is, that, *Iohn Stovv scarce knew what a consecration was.* Notwithstanding his ignorance, you confesse that he writ in his Annals the consecration of Cardinal *Poole*, who was the immediate Predecessor to *Parker*. Why did not he say so much at least of your first protestant Archiepiscopal solemnity, as he did

Pag. 197.

### 34. *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

did of the last Catholique, himselte being a protestant, and a greate servant of M. *Parkers*? Its no marvaile that he involved in silence the story of the *Nagshead*, because he had rather his Annals should be defective, then testify a truth that might prove dangerous to his person, and was disadvantageous to his profession. But that he would not, if with truth he could, grace his Church, friend, and Chronicle, with a narrative of *Parkers* solemne consecration at *Lambeth*, is incredible. Though he was no Divine, I hope he might write in his Annals, as learnedly as your Maister *Mason*, to wit that the Chappell of *Lambeth* on the 17. of December 1559. vvas adorned vvith tapestry on the east side, the floore covered vvith a read cloth, that there vvas greate concourse of people, lords, and courtiers, and that many grave persons received the communion vvith *Parker*. This much he might have said of his owne knowledge, or heard from the assistents, copied out of your Registers, if they had bin then as publique as you pretend, and he had believed they were authenticke. But after diligent search (saith D. Champney) he found the *Nagshead* story to be very true, and declared so much to some of his friends that testified the same to D. Champney, though they were as loath to be named, as some lords are, who heard the pretended Bishop of Durham in the late Parliament make the speech layd to his charge by the lord *Andley*.

D. Champ-  
ney edit.  
lat. pag.  
501.

2. To my third reason, to wit, that no man of conscience, or common sense, can imagine, that

that the Catholique Doctōrs of these times, as *Harding*, *Bristow*, *Stapleton*, and others, who had such care of their salvation as to suffer so much as they did vpon that account, should vvilfully damne their soules by obliging posterity vpon misinformation, to Reordaine your Ministers, if they had bin validly ordained before; it being a knowne Tenet of Catholiques, that we can not without committing a damnable sinne, no more Reordaine, then rebaptise. To this reason I say, you answer, *that if Reordination be damnable sacrilege, the authority of our owne Doctōrs may be a fit medium to convince our selves of sacrilege, not you of the invalidity of your ordination.* I am both sory, and ashamed to find so litle substance in my Adversaries answer; *Authority*, which must be a fit *medium* to perswade, supposeth two things in the Author; knowledge, and honesty. If he hath these two qualitties, no rational man (though of a contrary religion) can except against his relation, or testimony; for, his knowledge of the matter that is treated, doth free himselfe from the danger of being mistaken; and his honesty, doth assure others, that he will not misinforme them. Now M. Doctōr, can you object vvant of knowledge of your first Bishops consecrations, to *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Reynolds*, &c. They lived in that very time, and made it their buisnesse to observe all your Clergyes proceedings; and though they had not inquired after their ordination, they could not be ignorant of it, being

Pag. 202.

### 36 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

so rare, and notorious a solemnitie, as your Registers pretend: notwithstanding all this, they printed in those very times, that neither *Parker*, nor any of your first Bishops vvere consecrated, not so much as according to the lawes of the kingdome. Want of honesty you can not object to men that suffered so much for their conscience. How can you then assume their owne authority, as a fit *medium* to convince themselves of sacrilege? Is knowledge, and conscience a fit argument to prove, that they who are indowed with them, have committed damnable sinns, and ingaged posterity to do the same by Reordaining? If your Bishops ordination had bin as litle questioned, as our Doctors knowledge, and integrity, you might with some colour pretend, that your ordination is as fit a *medium* to convince vs of sacrilege, as our Doctors authority is, to demonstrate the nullity of your ordination. But hitherto never any man but your selfe excepted against *Harding*, *Stapleton*, or *Bristovus* knowledge concerning your Clergy, or against their conscience, and integrity, and your Orders have bin continually excepted against not only as invalid, but even illegal.

3. I know not to what purpose you cite the two Popes, if it be not to prove *Reordination* is lawfull: But you did ill to Father your ensuing words vpon so obvious an Author as *Be-larmine*. I hope *Stephen the sixth*, and *Sergius the third*, two Popes, were other manner of men then your English Doctors, and did both pretend to examine



mine the matter as duely, and to be as averſe from  
 his damnable ſacrilege as you; yet they decreed public-  
 ther ſquely, and moſt unjuſtly, that all the holy orders re-  
 vere received from Formoſus, were void; and compelled  
 o the all thoſe who had bin ordained by him, to be reor-  
 you dained. All this you lay to Bellarmineſ charge  
 much de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. cap. 12. whoſoever rea-  
 ffu- deth him, muſt diſcover your litle ingenuity;  
 m to Bellarmineſ words are. *Reſpondeo Stephanum, &*  
 ow- *Sergium non edidiſſe aliquod decretum, quo decerne-*  
 ove- *rent ordinatos ab Episcopo degradato, vel nomina-*  
 ave- *tim à Formoſo tanquam degradato, eſſe iterum or-*  
 po- *dinandos, ſed ſolum de facto juſſiſſe iterum eos or-*  
 our- *dinari: qua juſſio non ex ignorantia, aut hereſi,*  
 ned, *ſed ex odio in Formoſum procedebat.* Bellarm. de  
 you Rom. Pont. l. 4. cap. 2. I anſwer that Stephen,  
 our and Sergius did not publiſh any decree wherby they  
 ſ of decreed that ſuch as vvere ordained by a Biſhop de-  
 de- graded, or namely by Formoſus as degraded, ought  
 But to be reordained: but only that de facto commanded  
 ep- they ſhould be ordained againe. Which command  
 vus proceeded not from ignorance, or hereſi, but from the  
 iſt hatred they bore to Formoſus. You ſee Belarmine  
 Or- himſelfe denies, that Stephen, or Sergius pu-  
 not bliſhed any decree, and you affirme that Be-  
 larmino ſayes they decreed publicly that  
 the all the holy Orders received from Formoſus  
 ion were void. Belarmine accuſeth thoſe two Po-  
 ſu- pes of paſſion, and to the ſame attributs their  
 Be- commands of reordination: you indeavor to  
 the cleere them from it, and make them appeare  
 pen men of greater moderation then you judge in  
 a- your conſcience they were; not out of any af-  
 ine

38 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*  
 fection to the See Apostolique, but out of ha-  
 tred to our Catholique *Tenets* of not Reordai-  
 ning; but you labour in vaine; for these two  
 Popes were of the same judgment that wee  
 are, though passion made them practise what  
 they kuevv to be vnlavvful. If you could  
 prove that *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Bristovv*, and  
 the rest generally were men so vvicked, and  
 desperately bent to damne their soules to be  
 revenged of your first Prelates, or that they  
 held it safe in conscience to reordaine Priests,  
 and Bishops meerely vpon title that they had  
 bin ordained by hereticks, or that grave Ca-  
 suists in their time were of that opinion, then  
 your Reader might afford you attention, and  
 thinke you said something worth the ansve-  
 ring. But you know too wel the contrary.

---

## C H A P. V.

*That the Protestant forme of ordaining  
 Priests, and Bishops is of doubtfull  
 sufficiency, and that it vvas composed  
 by Zuinglians, who contemned Or-  
 dination as a rag of Rome.*

- I. **T**O my fourth reason against the  
 doubtfull sufficiency of your Prote-  
 stant forme, or words, vsed in the act  
 of consecration of Bishops, and Priests, you  
 ansver, that both these names, and functions,  
 are

*Pag. 223.*

*& seq.*

are sufficiently expressed by being presented to the Archbishop, and producing the Kings letters patents by the exhortation of the Consecraters, and by the litany that followeth; and the examination of him that is to be consecrated. This is new doctrine indeed, that men should be ordained by litanies, exhortations, presentations, and examinations. In our consecration of Bishops are comprehended also the words that are uttered in the anointing of the Bishops head, and hands, *Vngatur & consecretur caput tuum caelesti benedictione in ordine Pontificali*: and you see how cleerly the episcopal Order is therein expressed: neither doth our *Rituall* call the Bishop elect, consecrated, vntill these words be pronounced.

2. I grant that *Vasques*, and some other Divines of late, say, that episcopal Ordination is conferred by the words *Receive the holy Ghost*; but I never read any of them that gives a cleere solution to that argument, which you endeavor to answer, by saying, that these words *Receive the holy Ghost*, must be considered conjointly in a compounded sense with the litanies, &c. Whence it followeth, that the Sexton, or any other layman who answers, *Hear us O Lord we beseech thee*, hath no smal share in consecrating. But make the best of *Vasques* his opinion, it is no more then probable, and therefore doubtfull, and consequently ought not to be relied vpon in a matter that concerns the being, or not being of a Church: in things of such importance, we ought to fol-

40 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

lovv the securest vway by adhering to vndenia-  
ble principles. All you can say against vs, is  
that vve vse two formes both in priesthood,  
and episcopacy; but no Divine can take excep-  
tion against that, if he considers, that they are  
incomplete, and make but one total forme,  
without any danger of multiplicity of char-  
acters, or Reordination. But your forme makes  
yee, at the most, but halfe Priests, or Bishops;  
and that it selfe is as vncertaine, as it is doubt-  
full, whether the character can be divided. If we  
vse two eyther by one, or both all occasion of  
doubt is taken avway.

3. Yet I must tell you for your comfort, and  
instruction, M. Doctor, that it is not only a  
common, but tho most probable opinion, that  
Christ left to his Church power, to make par-  
ticular formes, both of priesthood, and epi-  
scopacy, (himselfe only determining in gene-  
ral, that the words should be applicable to the  
mysteries signified) vvithout which formes,  
neither of these Orders can be validly confer-  
red. This is the best vway to reconcile the  
Greeke, and Latin formes of ordination,  
and the ancient, and modern Rituals, though  
in every one is expressed the particular fun-  
ction of a Priest, or a Bishop. Only yours (be-  
cause it vvas composed vvhen Zuinglianisme  
prevailed in England) makes no men-  
tion of either, in any forme, or any thing li-  
ke a forme. But if you vvould be pleased to read  
Morinus, a late Author *de Ordinationibus sacris*,  
who may instruct both Polemick, and Schola-

st ick

stick writers in this matter, you will find how dangerous it is for particular persons, or Churches to alter the present, and approved use in the administration of the Sacrement of Order, or even to resume the practise of ancient Rituals canonically abrogated, much more when like malicious, or ignorant surgeons the Swinglian heretiques cut away nerves, and arteries, and the very substance vnder pretext of superfluous excrescences. You will find the danger of neglecting the vsual matter, and forme, notwithstanding these termes were not so vsual in all ancient times. Nor that your recourse to the grecian practise although it vvere like yours (as it is not) vvill secure you as it doth them, and you vvill find the Greeke and Latin vse much better reconciled by him then by vulgar Authors of your, or our profession, even better then by Arcudius, who gave some light to schoolemen in this particular. You will find the Roman Church to vse the most assured way that can be imagined, and never tooke away any thing that might give the least scruple either for the change, or the povver, or manner of changing. You vvill find you have but a most satisfactory discourse concerning the buisines of Formosus Pope, and his succeeding enemies. To transcribe all this at large, is neyther vsfull to the ignorant, who will vnderstand very litle, nor needfull to the learned who may see the author, nor proper to this short treatise which without all this doth evince the Nullity of your Clergy, and according  
to

## 42 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

to the most favourable opinion, of any tolerable Devine makes your Ordinaion in ahigh degree vncertaine.

*Pag. 232.* 4. But you deny that Zuinglianisme preuailed in England in Edvvard the 6. time, vwhen the 12. or 7. learned men forsooth, in the lavv of God, and the land, made your formes of Ordination. I hope you do not take vs to be as ignorant in the History of England, as one of your chiefe Doctors did a Gentlewoeman, lately in Paris; when (hearing of her inclinations to Catholique religion) he dissuaded her, from it, by assuring her, that it vvas not the ancient faith of England, nor ever professed in that Kingdome before Henry the 8. time. Do not all vnpartial vvritets mention the Protector *Seamours* perfidiousnesse in establishing Zvvinglianisme in England, during the minority of Edvvard the 6. contrary to his promise, and engagement to *Henry* the 8.? Is it not notorious that in the second Parliament of K. Edvvard. 6. begun the 4. of November 1548. (vvherin your booke of common praier, and administration of Sacraments, being imposed by Zuinglian heretiques chosen by the Protector and his faction, vvas confirmed) there vvas a great contention, vvwhether the Kingdome should be Lutheran, or Zuinglian in religion; and that after foure monthes debate, the Zuinglians did overbeare the other side, by some voices. And how *Peter Martyr*, and *Bucer* vvwere inspired by the poits that brought newes of the Parliaments resolution from *London*, to teach publi-

*Convers.  
of En-  
gland  
part. 2.  
pag. 607.  
& pag.  
611.*

bliquely in the Vnniversities, that Christ vvas not present in the Sacrament of the alter, and that *this is my body* was no more then *this is the signe of my body*. Is it not evident by Iohn Fox (an Author of your own) his Acts, and Monuments, that the far greater part of all your Protestant Saints, and Martyrs, were put to death for denying the real presence, and not only transubstantiation? Do not the bookes which our Catholique Doctors writ against your first superintendens demonstrate, that these were of the same opinion with your Martyrs? But vvhat need we go farther then the 25. of your 39. articles, and translations of Scripture, to prove your Zuinglian Tenets in matter of holy Orders? They who thrust out of Scripture in the English versions, the words *Priest*, and *Bishop*, (putting instead therof *Elder*, and *Superintendent*) were not likely men to put them, or expresse their function in your formes of ordination. But you say that in the Preface yee *maintaine to all the vvorld, that the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, have bin ever from the beginning in the Church of Christ*. Are men ordained by your Preface? or because in your Preface it is maintained that the Church of Christ had alvvayes the said Orders, doth it follow that the English Church in those times was the Church of Christ? Call them Svvinglians, call them Lutherans, call them what you plaese, their Creed, their versions, their writings, show they contemned Consecration, and we-

Part. 3.

Convers.

pag 372

edit. 1604

Pag. 232.

#### 44 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

re content with election, and when they vsed some thing like consecration, it was to satisfy the people not themselves. And that *Whitaker*, and *Fulke*, whom you cite pag. 233. never admitted the necessity of consecrated Bishops, no the very state of the question disputed in those times betweene our English sectaries, was not about consecrated, or not consecrated Bishop but whether one Minister was to be elected to Lord it over the rest. Most of the Ministers misliked it, but the Prince approved it for reason of state, thereby to Keepe the Clergy in awe. and to have so many mercenary Votes in the house of Lords.

Pag. 235.

5. At length you tell vs that if your ancestors have pared away any thing out of mistake from ordination, that is either prescribed, or practised by the true Catholique Church, let it be made appeare evidently to you, and you are more ready to welcome it againe at the fore dore then your Ancestours were to cast it out at the back dore. *Errare possumus, haeretici esse nolumus*. Your Church hath so many times changed its *Tenets*, and is so indifferent for any beneficial addition, or subtraction of doctrine, that it seemes to be composed of nothing but back dores, and starting holes, wherby you cast out, and welcome in, whatsoever is gratefull, or not gratefull to the humor of the Prince, or prevailing faction. Now seing it hath bin made appeare, that your Ancestours valued not episcopal consecration, admitted no priesthood but baptisme, and denied the real presence; I hope you can

not



not imagine, that these men would compose formes of Ordination contrary to their owne Tenets, and profession: or that a Zuinglian Parliament would confirme your booke of administration of Sacraments, and rites, before they had vvell examined, whether it contained any thing contrary to their owne conscience, and reformation. And if they had bin Lutherans you gaine litle, seing Luther himselfe in the places alleadged in the next chapter maketh all Christians Priests by baptism.

6. But suppose it had not bin evident, but only probable, that your Ancestors passed avway some part of the essentiall forme, or matter of Ordination; is it part of your Case Theology, to contemne prudent doubts in a matter of so greate importance, and of absolute necessity for the being of a Church? There is not a more infallible marke of heresy, then to exact cleere evidence for obscure mysteries, or to contemne ancient publique ceremonies, vpon the warrant of a moderne private spirit, as you might have seene, (and ought to have refuted, if you could) in the Treatise of Catholique faith, and heresy. But it seenes you regard not what is thought of your Heresy, provided you may seeme to maintaine your episcopacy: and that yee are content to vndergo the infamy of sectaries, so vee retaine the titles of Lords, and Bishops. You say we have such an eye at your Order, and  
*uniformity, that wee can not let your long cloakes,*

*Pag. 234.*

46 *The Nullity of the Prelatique and surplises alone.* As for vniformity yee never had any ; and your vvant of Orders makes vs take notice of the superfluity of your long cloakes , and surplisses. The old Protestant cut would become yee much better , and I believe yee will returne to it , and welcome it at the fore dore of your Church (alvvayes open for any advantage) if the puritan , or presbyterian faction prevaile.

---

## C H A P. V I.

*That the Pope did not confirme Edward 6. forme of Ordination, and that all sectaries admitted no priesthood, but baptisme, and that in Henry the 8. reigne, and Edward the 6. men played the Bishops though never consecrated, and so did Barlovv;*

Pag. 63.

1. **T**O my first reason you answernothing to the purpose , but only that King *Edvvards* forme of ordination vv as judged valid in *Queene Maries* days by all Catholiques, and particularly by Cardinal *Pole* then Apostolicall legate in England , and by the then Pope *Paul* the 4 and by all the Clergy , and Parliament of England. This you prove by Cardinal *Poles* dispensation (vvhich the Pope confirmed) to all those that were ordained,

## Clergy of England. 47

ned, *Pratensa autoritate supremitatis Ecclesie Anglicana*, pretending the Authority of the English supremacy. I perceave by your other bookes you are well versed in *Foxes*, Acts and monuments, and some what in the Dutch Centurists vvith the story, and statutes of England, whence you gather what in passion hath bin done against the Popes authority vpon certaine abuses. The attention to that, made you not reflect vpon, this decree, or article (as *Fox* calls it) of *Q. Maries*, made by the consent of the Lords spiritual, and temporal.

*Fox pag. 1295.*

*Item touching such persons as vvvere here:ofore promoted to any Orders, after the new sort, and fashion of Orders; considering they vvvere not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the Diocese, finding othervvise sufficiency, and ability in these men, may supply that thing which vvanted in them before and then according to his discretion, admit them to Minister.* I hope this Article, or Decree, made vvith the consent, and advise of Cardinal *Poole*, and of the Lords spiritual, and temporal of England, doth sufficiently declare, that his Dispensation, and the Popes confirmation vvvas intended, and extended only to such, as had bin ordained after the ancient and Catholique manner in the time of schisme. Of others promoted to any Orders after the new fashion, and forme of *Edvvard the 6.* its declared, they *vvvere not ordered in very deed*, and therefore the Bishop ought to supply their want of ordination. And yet you are so confident as to say, that *the question in Q. Maries*

## 48      *The nullity of the Prelatique*

\* *Luther. dayes, vvas not about the validity, or invalidity of rom. 2. de your Orders, but about the legality, or illegality of Min Ec- them. I pray you, not to be ordered in very deed, is clesia in- it only an illegality?*

*fol.- 368.*      2. The ill successe you had in recurring to  
*seq. & King Edwards forme, and Bishops, doth for- de abro- ce you appeale to Henry the 8. times, wherein ganda you imagine that neither Barlow, nor any other missa pri- durst play the Bishop, if not cōsecrated; becau- uata to. se forsooth, Henry the 8. was not a Baby to be iea- 2. fol. 249. sted withall. Pag. 186. We know M. Doctor, that & in lib. Henry the 8. was no Baby, but you also ought de capt. te have knowen, that he was a man more led Babylon. by passion, then by reason, or religion. Af- C. de or- ters. ter that he perceived, how the Pope was resol-*

*Peter Martyr in*      ved not to declare voyd his marriage with *2.*  
*1. Cor. 11. Chatharine of Spaine, he did so persecute his vers. 5. adherents, and authority, vvithout regard to*

*Zuinglius rom. 1. ex- planat. a. 17. sine.*      conscience, or even to his owne statuts, that his principal care was to countenance heretical Preachers, and principles, as far as they

*D. Horne and the first protestant Bishops in the Harbo- rough an. 1559 H. 2. Three Cō- vers of England part 2. pag. 570. & 571.*      concurred to maintaine his headship of the Church to enrich him with the spoiles therof, to vex, and endommage the Pope. \* Now heretiques generally in those days, did agree in this principle, *that there is no other priesthood in the lawv of grace, but baptisme*, and therefore all Christians both men, and women, were Priests, and might preach, and Ministers all Sacra- ments; though to avoyd confusion, the exercise of Priestly authority ought to be committed to some, either by election of the Magistrate, or by the letters patents of the Prince.

This

This doctrine they grounded vpon 1. Pet. 2. Apoc. 1. *Christ made vs all a holy nation, a royal priesthood, and Priests to his father* This principle vvas so futable to Henry the 8. designe of making himselfe supreme head of the Church in spirituall affaires, and of possessing himselfe of its temporalities, that he was well pleased to winke at the practise of all heretiques, who pretended to be Bishops, though they never had bin consecrated: Archbishop *Cranmer* (to whom all such matters were remitted) being himselfe a prime heretique, and in so greate favor with the King, that *Cromwell* before his fall sayd vnto him, (being accused of denying the real presence) *My Lord of Canterbury you are most happy of all men, for you may doe, and speake vvhath you list, and let all men speake against you vvhath they can, the King vvill never believe one vvord, to your detriment, or hinderance, &c.* There was no such danger of *Pre-munires*, as D. *Bramhall* pretends; who would have vs take his word against the evidences cited in the margin, that only *Anabaptists*, and not *Zvvinglians*, rejected ordination. See Fox pag. 1694 & 1695.

3. They who forged *Masons Register*, thought fit to name among *Parkers Consecrators Barlow*, and *Hodgkins* both pretended Bishops in King Henry the 8. reigne, not doubting therby to make it credible, that they both, and consequently *Parker*, were validly consecrated, though *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, (the tyvo other pretended Consecrators) had never received (being made protestant

## 48      *The nullity of the Prelatique*

\* *Luther. dayes, vvvas not about the validity , or invalidity of tom. 2. de your Orders , but about the legality , or illegality of Min Ec- them. I pray you , not to be ordered in very deed , is clesia in- it only an illegality ? stituendis*

*fol. - 368. 2. The ill successe you had in recurring to & seq. & King Edwards forme , and Bishops , doth for- de abro- ce you appeale to Henry the 8. times , wherin ganda you imagine that neither Barlow, nor any other missa pri- durst play the Bishop, if not cōsecrated; becau- vata to. se forsooth, Henry the 8. was not a Baby to be iea- 2. fol. 249. sted wi: hall. Pag. 186. We know M. Doctor, that & in lib. Henry the 8. was no Baby , but you also ought de capt. te have knowen , that he was a man more led Babylon. by passion , then by reason , or religion. Af- C. de or- ter that he perceived, how the Pope was resol- dine. ved not to declare voyd his marriage with 2.*

*Peter Martyr in 1. Cor. 11. Chatharine of Spaine , he did so persecute his vers. 5. adherents , and authority , vvwithout regard to*

*Zuinglius tom. 1. ex- planat. a. 17. fine. conscience , or even to his owne statuts , that his principal care was to countenance hereti- cal Preachers , and principles , as far as they*

*D. Horne and the first pro- testant Bishops in the Harbo- rough an. 1559 H. 2. concurred to maintaine his headship of the Church to enrich him with the spoiles therof, to vex, and endommage the Pope. \* Now he-*

*retiques generally in those days , did agree in this principle , that there is no other priestshood in the lavv of grace , but bap:isme , and therfore all*

*Christians both men, and women, were Priests, and might preach , and Ministers all Sacra- ments ; though to avoyd confusion, the exer- cise of Priestly authority ought to be commit- ted to some , either by election of the Magi- strate , or by the letters patents of the Prince.*

*This*

*& 571.*

## Clergy of England.

49

This doctrine they grounded vpon 1. Pet. 2. Apoc. 1. *Christ made vs all a holy nation, a royal priesthood, and Priests to his father* This principle vvas so sutable to Henry the 8. designe of making himselfe supreme head of the Church in spirituall affaires, and of possessing himselfe of its temporalities, that he was well pleased to winke at the practise of all heretiques, who pretended to be Bishops, though they never had bin consecrated: Archbishop *Cranmer* (to whom all such matters were remitted) being himselfe a prime heretique, and in so greate favor with the King, that Cromwell before his fall sayd vnto him, (being accused of denying the real presence) *My Lord of Canterbury you are most happy of all men, for you may doe, and speake vvhath you list, and let all men speake against you vvhath they can, the King vvill never believe one vvord, to your detriment, or hinderance, &c.* There was no such danger of *Pre-munires*, as D. Bramhall pretends; who would have vs take his word against the evidences cited in the margen, that *only Anabaptists, and not Zvinglians, rejected ordination.*

See Fox  
pag. 1694  
& 1695.

Pag. 196.

3. They who forged *Masons Register*, thought fit to name among Parkers Consecraters *Barlow*, and *Hodgkins* both pretended Bishops in King Henry the 8. reigne, not doubting therby to make it credible, that they both, and consequently *Parker*, were validly consecrated, though *Scory*, and *Co-verdale*, (the tyvo other pretended Consecraters) had never received (being made protestant

50 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*  
 testant Bishops in King Edvwards time ) e-  
 piscopal ordinaion. But this shift availes them  
 not ; I produce two others , who were called  
 Bishops in King Henries time , sate in Parlia-  
 ment , and tooke vpon them to exercise all  
 episcopal functions with as greate gravity , and  
 solemnity , as *Barlow* ; and yet they were de-  
 declared by publique sentence in *Q. Maries*  
 time , to be no Bishops , nor validly consecra-  
 ted. These were *Latimer* , and *Ridley* , to whom  
 D. *Brookes* Bishop of Glocester , in his last  
 speech , before they were put to death for he-  
 resy , told ; that *they were to degrade them only*  
*of priesthood , because they were no Bishops.* To  
 this you answer M. Doctor , that they who ma-  
 de no scruple to take away their lives , would  
 make none tot take away their Orders. You  
 are quite out. *Cranmer* was burnt for heresy , as  
 well as *Latimer* , and *Ridley* ; and yet they  
 made a scruple to take away his Orders , though  
 they tooke away his life ; because they knew  
 he had validly received orders , and therfore  
 was degraded ; the same would have bin pra-  
 ctised with *Latimer* , and *Ridley* , if the omission  
 of degrading them , had not bin vvaranted by  
 evidence , that they vv ere never validly con-  
 secrated.

Fox pag.  
 1604.

4. *We have often , sayth D. Bramhall , asked*  
*a reason of them , why the Protestants should decli-*  
*ne their ovvne consecrations ? They give us one ,*  
*that Barlovv , as most of the Clergy in England in*  
*those times , vv ere Puritans , and inclined to*  
*Zuinglianism ; therfore they contemned , and re-*  
*jected*



## Clergy of England.

51

Pag. 193.

In the Har-  
bor an.

1559.

Protest.

Apology

iv. 2. C. 2.

sect. 10.

subd. 7.

Confut.

Apul. fol.

60.

*Consecration, as a rag of Rome, &c.* This reason the Doctor solidly refutes, by saying, *It is a greate boldnesse, to take the liberty to cast aspersions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation.* If it be a boldnesse to say, that your first Protestant Bishops contemned, and rejected consecration, and that they were of the same opinion concerning it, with *Luther, Zuin- glius*, and other Reformers; themselves, and not I, are guilty of the crime. Did not *M. Horne*, and the rest of your first Bishops, publish to the world in print an. 1559. (the very same yeare of the pretended consecration) their sense of Priesthood, and Priestly functions, in these words. *In this point we must use a certaine moderation and not absolutely in every wise de- barre women herein, &c.* I pray you what more vehemency useth *S. Paul* in forbidding women to preach, then in forbidding them to uncover their heads; and yet you know in the best reformed Churches of Germany, all the maides be bare headed. This your first Bishops tenet of admitting no other Priesthood but baptisme and consequently of allowing women to be Priests, was so well knowne, that *D. Harding* objects it to *Iewel, Parker*, and the rest, *If yee allow not every man, yea and every woman to be a Priest.* why drive yee not some of your fellows to recant, that so have preached? Why allow yee the bookes of your new Evangelists, that so have written?

5. If this be not sufficient to excuse my boldnesse, and condemne the Doctors mistake, let him read the 25 article of his Creed, which

K

is

## 52 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

is this. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreame unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospell, being such as have growne partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life, allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with baptisme, and the Lords supper, for that they have not any visible signe, or ceremony ordained of God. It evidently followeth out of this article; that your first Bishops, who made, and published it an 1562. were of opinion, that imposition of hands in ordination, was not ordained by God; vnlesse you will deny imposition of hands to be a visible signe; and ceremony. How doth this agree with your moderne Prelatique principles? doth it not evince that *Parker*, and the rest condemned in their judgment imposition of hands, and condemned it as an idle superstition of Rome? The evidence that the world had of their not being consecrated, made them vtter so absurd doctrine, and impose it as an article of faith vpon ignorant Protestants. Whether they were Zvinglians, Lutherans, Calvinists, or vwhat you please, their profession of faith shewes what account they made of imposition of hands; which is the buisines now in hand, and makes them Syvinglians, and Puritans in this point.

*Pag. 195.*

6. Yet you would faine know how cometh *Barlow* to be taxed of Puritanisme? because forsooth, you find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his

## Clergy of England.

53

*his Cope officiating, ordaining, confirming.* Or because *Swinglius* his first sermon was in the 10. or 11. yeare of Henry the eight, and *Barlow* sate in Parliament in the 31. therefore *Barlow* could not be a *Svinglian*. This is your learned discourse out of Chronology. I must allow you more time to summe vp your numbers, or to save you a labour, tell you before hand that make, what account you please, you will find that *Luther* himselfe begun the contempt of sacred Orders, though *Swinglius* after insisted more vpon it, and there vvas time enough for *Barlovv* cyther to take it from *Svinglius*, or at least from *Luther*, which is all one to our present purpose. As for his ordaining others you vvill have much adoe to prove it, at least those you would have: for vve have proved your Registers to be forged; but if any such thing be attempted, you may conclude his presumption, not his consecration, And for his Robes, Rochet, Cope and Cap, the spirit doth dispence with all puritans to weare them, when they are named Bishops. I hope *John Hooper*, one of the purest brethren that England ever bred, had as tender a conscience as *William Barlovv*; but when he was to be made Bishop of *Glocester*, he vv as faine (sayth Fox-  
to agree to this condition, that some times in his ser-  
mons, he should shevv himselfe aparalled as the  
other Bishops vv ere. And yet it is evident, that  
he vv as never consecrated, though *Cranmer*,  
and *Ridley*, who were his enemies, forced him  
to weare a square Cap, and a linnend, Rochet,

Pag. 136.

#### 54 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

the only character of a protestant Bishop. Though they wanted the reality and truth of consecration, yet they insisted upon this formality, and cloke of ambition, in their *sinister* (as Iohn Fox calls it) *and unlucky contention*.

Pag. 1456

7. And that you may see what litle hazard your protestant Bishops did runn of *Præmunires* by such practises, *John Fox* tells you, how *D. Ridley* that *vvoribby Bishop of London*, called *John Bradford* to take the degree of *Deacon*, according to the Order that then vvvas in the Church of England, (vvhich was the forme of *Edvvard the 6.*) but for that this order was not vvithout some such abuse, as to the vvhich *Bradford* vvould not consent, the Bishop then vvvas content to Order him *Deacon* vvithout any abuse, even as he desired. After this *Deaconship* he was immediately vvithout any orders, made *Prebend*, and *Preacher* of *S. Paules*, having never studied but one yeare, and all his life before having bin a serving man to *Sr. John Harington*. Doe you imagine *M. Doctor*; that *Barlowes* Consecrater vvould not be as indulgent to him, as *Ridley* was to *Bradford*? Or do you thinke that *Ridley* vvould not venture as farre for his owne conscience, when he vvvas to be consecrated, as he did for that of his *Deacon*? There vvvas no such rigour or danger of *Præmunires* in those dayes, as you endeavor to perlwade your Reader: neither *Henry the 8.* nor his Vicar General *Cromvvvel*, nor Archbishop *Cranmer*, nor sir *Thomas Andley* a Lutheran, and Chancellor

celor after Sir *Thomas More*, did thinke it vvas for their purpose, to presse any other ordination, or Consecration vpon tender consciences, but baptisme; because by this principle the King had some colour for his spiritual headship, and for the temporalities of the Church; and the three others by dissembling, and suspending the rigour of the lawes vwith a pretense of enriching the King, countenanced, and planted their owne errors in the Kingdome.

8. What wonder is it therefore, if the consecration of Protestant Bishops should not appeare in any Register but yours and *Barlowes* in none at all seeing it was against their principles, and practise, to be consecrated. But your invisible Register hath a property of making visible, what never had a being. *Yet by the helpe of those Records vvhich are in the Court of faculties; I should not despaire* (sayth the Doctor) *of finding Barlowes consecration.* I must confesse my ignorance of your Court of faculties, but likewise acknowledge my experience of the faculties of your Court, and Church, in finding things never thought of by any but your selves. But where trow you, doth the Doctor hope to find out *Barlowes* consecration? I am confirmed, Pag. 183.  
*saith he, in my former conjecture, that he vvas consecrated in Wales, which Bishop Goodwin had much more reason to know exactly then we have.* Yet Bishop *Geadvin* speaking of *Barlow* in three sundry places, viz as Bishops of S. Davids, Bath, and Welles, & Chishester sayes not a word of his cōsecration in any of them, for Pag. 191.

56 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

of his being B. of S. Asaph there is no mention in the English edition, much lesse of his being consecrated there, though you tell vs that in his Latin edition printed at London 1616. are these vvords, *he vvvas consecrated* 22. Feb. 1535. From whence came this new knowledge? It is à preparation, and disposition for a further forgery? Without doubt the next edition wil say, he was consecrated at S.  *Davids* or S. Asaph in Wales, and that indeed may confirme your conjecture of the place, and my evidence of your Clergies practise of forging Registers. But why you should hope, or conjecture that *Barlows* consecration, after the effluxion of a hundred yeares, may be found in *Wales*, I vnderstand not, if it be not, that you are resolved, to imitate the example of meane upstarts, who insert their families into welch pedigrees. So yee, it seemes, intend to furnish your upstart Church, and Clergies want of Ordination, with welch Registers; as in an other occasion you indeavored to prove your independency of Rome, by a welch proverb. You are pleased to say ( but without any prooffe ) that Barlows leases made in the sees of S. Davids, Bath, and Wels, were never questioned. We deny it. And prove our denial by the example of Ridley, who being as much à Bishop in Henry the 8. time as *Barlow*, begged, as a favor before his death, of *Q Mary*, that the leases made by him in the see of London, might stand good. This you may reade in your owne *John Fox* where he relates *Ridleys* martyr dome. What greater right I pray, could  
*Barlowu*

*Barlow* pretend for the vauidity of his leales, then his brother *Ridley*, both of them being pretēded Bishops of Henry the 8. time? You are very unfortunate in all your arguments, unlesse your intention be prevarication of your cause, to make your selfe more looked after upon the title of deriving your Episcopacy from the line of Irish Prelacy which thoug I can not say it had its beginning in a Taverne as the English had: yet it wanted as much in the substance. Had there bin true Bishops in Ireland who could have bin brought to lay hands on the new Superintendents, the Queene might have saved her labour and credit of giving such enormous dispensations as never were heard of. Besides I must aske you a question in your eare. Were you Mr. Doctor made Priest in Ireland? you find an occasion to thrust in your being Bishoped in Ireland, but I can not find you speake of the other, and you know that no Priest, no Bishop. But although you were, if matters litle for your Irish descent is no better then the English, nor any reason hitherto hath bin produced to make it better.



*D. Bramhalls ten reasons against the Nagshead story refuted, and retorted against Masons Records, and the fable of the first Protestant Bishops Consecration at Lambeth.*

1. **W**E are come at length to the Nagshead, M. Doctor, the place of your florishes and triumphs; against this very true story, you produce ten reasons, to make it incredible, which I will not only refute, but retort against your Records, and feigned Consecration at Lambeth. Your first reason against the Nagshead story, *Is taken from the palpable contradictions of the Catholique Writers, who have related this tale of a tub.* Let us heare these palpable contradictions. *The common opinion is, that Scory alone did consecrate them. But M. Constable, one of their principal Authors, supposeth (thus you English me laet) that Barlow might joyne with him in that; and Sanders, leaveth it doubtfull, when or where, or by whom they were ordeined.* You must have learned a peevisish wrangling logique, that makes you fall vpon another as contradicting you, when you affirming the thing to be so, he doth not say no, but only *me laet* I doe not know. But you say that M. Wadsworth only doth affirme that there was an attempt to consecrate Parker. All others writers say the

*Pag. 31.*

*Pag. 32.*

*See Chappney edit. Lat. 1618. pag. 502.*

*Pag. 33.*



the same. There was no more then an attempt that *Landaffe* should consecrate *Parker*. I hope you do not imagine, that we take *Scoryes* ridiculous ceremony vvith *Parker*, and the rest, to be an episcopal consecration, it vv as no more then an absurd attempt. Here is another contradiction of people that say the same thing in different words.

2. Seing these contradictions are so farre from being palpable, that they are not intelligible, the Doctor brings others. *Other say, there was more then an attempt, but they name none. Others name some, but they accord not one vvith an other in naming them. Some say Jewel, Sands, Horne &c. Others say Parker Grindall &c. Lastly others say, they were all ordeined there.* Here we have a contradiction of some & others. Why do not you name these others, and some? who are they? where met you vvith them? I have sought our Authours that vvrite of this matter, and find not those *Some*, or others named or unnamed? Must I credit more your saying, then my ovvne seeking?

Against your feigned consecration at Lambeth. I bring no contradictions of *others*, or *some*, I name your Bishop *Goodwin*, D. *Sudcliffe*, and M. *Butler*, I give you their names, and their vvords. And though you attribute their contradictions to the Transcriber, or printer, the vnpartial Reader will hardly believe that such *Erratas* should passe the pen, or the presse, as *Bedford* for *Dover*, *John* for *Richard*, one month for another, &c. And vvill further re-

## 60 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

flect vpon the difference of stories recorded, and related. In these, both dayes, and monthes, or the names of persons are easily forgot, and some diversity herein argues nocertainty of the fact. But what is alledged as taken out of Records vwill be much suspected if the Relators differ in those particularities which in records are alwayes precisely specified.

3. Your second reason against the *Nagshead* story, is *the latenesse of the Discovery* of it to the world, *after forty yeares were passed*. But this you refute your selfe by the story you tell vs of *Theophilus Higgins*, who was (as you say) converted to Catholique Religion by reflecting vpon the *Nagshead* consecration; and that M. *Clerke*, vvho had bin an Actuary in Cardinal *Poles* legative Court, approved well of his caution; but vvithall vvished, that vvhat Catholiques had vvritten concerning the *Nagshead* story, could be made good, &c. Heer you confesse that it vvvas published by our vvriters, and that it came not only to the eares, but the hearts of Protestants; and yet in other places of your booke you say it never once peeped into the light vntil K. James his reigne, and that it vvvas only vvhispered in corners amongst Catholiques. You have given the advantage of a story, I knevv not, vvwhich you are not vsed to doe vvhen you defende a cause in good earnest.

4. But you *appeale to my judgment vvwhether it be credible, that this story should be notoriously knowne to the vvorld in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths*

pag. 37.  
C. 38.

pag. 125.  
C. 126.

pag. 46.

## Clergy of England.

61

beths reigne, and yet neither Stapleton, nor Harding, nor any one of all the Roman Catholique Writers, should so much as mention it for forty yeares ensuing. I appeale to your eyes M. Doctor, and desire you to read in your owne Bishop Goodvin, whose knowledge you so much esteeme, these words. *The 17. of December 1559. is consecrated (Parker) according to the rites received in our Church, &c. If you inquire of the place of this consecration, it was no other but the accustomed, to wit, the Chappell of the Archbishop at Lambeth, howeuer the most impudent Raylers Harding, Fitzsimons, and others, give other relations; although Harding in some manner may be pardoned, because he related things not before called in question by any, though not believed by himselfe. For vvh'o in his vvrits vvould give credit to a calomny so ridiculous, and so farre from all probability. Is not this the Nagshead Taverne consecration M. Doctor? Is not this the ridiculous story you so much detest? Doe you remember vvhen D. Harding lived? Its no marvel you should not know what our Authors writ concerning this subiect, being so ill versed in your owne. You may see how particularly M. Constable, cited by D. Champney, and your selfe, writ and described the whole story, in the begiuning of Q Elizabeths reig-*

Goodwin  
in edit.  
Londin.  
1616. pag.  
218. &  
219.

Pag. 32.

## 82 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

hops, then Tavern Bishops. If yee had stood in *Sanders* time, vpon succession, and ordination by imposition of hands, as you did in King *James* his Reigne, not only he, but all other Catholique Doctors, had written as particularly the Nagshead story, as *Holwood*, *Fitzsimons* Champney, &c. But in *Queene Elizabeths* time yee relied vpon her letters patents, or vpon the Act of Parliament 8. Elizabeth. 1. And therefore *Harding* in the name of all our Doctors objected to your first Bishops:

*Confut. Apol. fol. 57.* If yee can prove no succession, then wherby hold yee? Will yee shew vs the letters patents of the Prince? Though they have thus promoted you, yet be yee presumers, and thrusters in of yourselves.

*Fol. 60.* Lands, and Mannours the Prince may give you, Priesthood, and Bishoprick (or Episcopacy) the Prince can not give you.

6. Apply I beseech you, M. Doctor, the lateness of the discovery of your feigned Consecration at Lambeth, and you will be convinced of the forgery of your Registers. For the space of more then 50. yeares, not one word was spoken of it amongst Catholiques, or Protestants not with standing the urgent necessity not a Syllable written of it in any History that could be seene, untill in the yeare 1605. it was thought fit to foist into *Antiquitates Britanniae* a certaine Register of *Parkers*, and his Collegues consecration, but named not Lambeth. At length about the yeare 1613. it was thought time, to publish in print the solemnity of Lambeth, at which all ancient and knowing

knowing men were startled, and concluded, that it deserved no more credit, then if a French man should now write, or shew records that in the battell of *Pavia*, not *Francis* the first, but *Charles* the first was taken prisoner, and his whole army defeated. You have not any thing to say for your selves, but that the crime of forging records which we lay to your charge, is a grievous crime; it is so indeed, but very ordinary amongst heretiques. Two epistles were foisted into the first synod, one of *Vigilius* Pope, an other of *Menas* Patriarch of Constantinople, which was detected in the 6. synod in the 12. and 14. action upon reading over the Acts of the 5. Synod; for they found three whole quaternions inserted by the heretiques, and in them the two foresaid letters. Pope *Leo* the greate in his 38. epistle, ad *Palæstinos*, complains of the Grecians, that they had corrupted his letter to *Flavianus*. And S. Gregory the greate avers that those of Constantinople had corrupted the synod of *Calcedon*, and suspects they had donne the same with the Councell of *Ephesus*. And as for that of *Calcedon*, it appeares cleerly the clause of the Bishop of Constantinople having equal privileges with the Bishop of Rome, to have bin falsely inserted; both because the fathers of the Councell in their relation to *Leo* the Pope, never ownd it, only said, *we have confirmed the rule of the 150. Fathers assembled at Constantinople, which ordained, that after your most holy and Apostolique See, that of Constantinople*

*Lib. 5. Epist. 14. ad Narsem.*

# 64 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*should have the second place of honor. And accordingly Evagrius reports this Canon, it was decreed saith he, that the See of new Rome, by reason she held the second place after the ancient Rome, should have the primacy before the other Sees. And Socrates testifieth no more to have bin decreed in the Councell of Constantiple. And Justinian the Emperour speaking of both these Councils, sayth, As the holy Pope of Rome is the first of all Prelates, so the Archbishop of Constantinople, new Rome, should have the second place after the See Apostolique of old Rome, and be preferred before all other Sees. So you may see M. Doctor, this grievous crime is no new thing, and no lesse possible, then probable that your protestant forefathers were as well versed in falsifying Registers, as the Grecians, and Arrians. But you need no information in this matter. And for the information of others I shall vpon occasion of Morton make it appeare how litle conscience, and ashame your Ministers have in point of wilfull falsifications.*

7. Your third reason against the Nags head Consecration you take from the strictnesse of the english lawes. But this hath, bin answered in the 3. Chapter, and the largenesse of the Queenes letters patents, and statutes in favor of the Nagshead consecration, demonstrated.

8. Your fourth reason is, *that there was no necessity to play this pageant. But in this you contradict*

Lib 2. c. 4

Lib. 5. c. 8.

Novel.  
131.

Pag. 47.

dict the Queenes commission, and letters patents, as you may see in the said 2. Chap. And besides D. Banewfi beares witnesse against you in the answer he gave to M. Alabaster, that he *hoped, in case of necessity a Priest might ordaine Bishops.* You answer, *I do not believe a word of what is said of B. Bancroft, sub modo, as it is heer set down. For my part I believe the whole relateon is feined.* Is this your polemick manner of answering? If you desire to be satisfied of the substance, and manner of this story, for as much of it as concerns me, that is the faithfull relation, you may find it in the Jesuits libraryes of *Gant, Antwerp, ad Brussels*, in Holiwoods booke, *de investiganda Christi Ecclesia.* Cap. 4. But if you imagine that Father Holiwood did feigne such a story, I must let you know, that he was not only one of the most learned Doctors of his time, having taught Divinity in some of the chiefe universities of Europ with great satisfaction, and applause; but that he was esteemed by all who knew him, a man of eminent vertu, and supernaturall gifts. He foretold the future miseries of his Countrey (Ireland) when it was most florisking; and assured that the posterity of the ancient english Conquerours, inhabiting the English *Pale*, would be driven out of their howses, and homes, though since the conquest they were never more favored by the state, then when he told this to *F. Robert Nugent*, and others. Being heire to a faire estate, and chiefe of a noble family, he renounced all that his birth had

Pag. 133.

C. 140.

## 66 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

had given, and his hopes, or deserts might promise, to follow Christ in a religious state of life. Now to say that this man feigned *Bancrofts* answer, and printed such an imposture in Bancrofts life time, is no better then a childish evasion, or such a Ministers confutation, as undertooke to refute Bellarmine, by saying, *Bellarmino thou lye'st.*

9. You are pleased also to call D. *Sanders* relation of the Irish Archbishops refusal to consecrate your first Superintendents, a vaine report, because forsooth the *Archbishop* wanteth a name, and the fable wanteth a ground. His name was *Richard Creagh* Archbishop of Armach, who died many yeares afterward in the tower of London. You say that if Consecraters had bin wanting in England, *Yee might have seven out of Ireland, and that your Irish protestant Consecration was never questioned.* Its strange that the Bishops of Ireland should comply so with your heresy, whereas it is well known that three hundred persons of the whole nation could not be drawn to it, either by faire, or foule meanes, since Henry the 8. Schisme, untill King Charles his reigne. Your Irish consecration is every jot as invalid as your english, neither can you make it appeare, that any Catholique Bishop ever imposed hands (*Macragh* was never consecrated as his owne friars testify) vpon your first protestant Superintendents of Ireland, who were all made Bishops, by the Queens letters patents and with as litle consecration as those of England. Is

it

Pag. 50.  
C. 51.

*Anal. Et.  
sacr. His-  
ber. edit.  
1617.*

*Fitz. Si-  
mons in  
Britan.  
nomach.*



it credible that if the Queene could have found in Ireland true Bishops that could have bin brought to impose hands vpon those that were to be ordained in England, that she would have alledged such necessity as you have seene in the 2. Chapt. could not she have called for her owne subjects? Rather then give such a power as never vvas heard of supplying the want of the condition, and state of the person, and adding such words as imply the sufficiency of one person, and even a lay person. If she might have had several true Bishops out of Ireland, would this have bin done? If they had consecrated Protestants in Ireland, would they have refused the like in England? though you have no ground to build vpon your Irish succession yet I have ground enough in your worke to suspect, that you have willingly, and wittingly prevaricated in the succession of your English Bishops, that they may be forced to recurre to your Irish ordination. Truly in your booke, you have given me so many advantages against your cause, that I shall never accuse my selfe of rashnesse for this suspicion of your plaine prevarication, or at least it must have bin a most vaine presumption to thinke that vvith petty tricks of auoiding rather, then ansvvering the force of arguments, and flourishing vvith your negative testimonies about a speech of one man, you can maintaine a cause vpon so many, and manifest titles defective. What if there had bin a mistake about Mortons speech,

# 68 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

is the prize vvonne on your side? Is the question stated vpon that circumstance? Your fifth reason is drawne from a principle of Rhetorique. Cui bono? or vvhath *advantage could such a consecration as that of the Nagshead bring to the Consecraters, or the persons consecrated?* I shall tell you vvhath? It served, seing they could get no better, to raise a rumour that they had bin consecrated, and thereby to delude the people which had not so soone fully learned the nevv doctrine of those times, that election vwithout consecration vvas sufficient. This vvas all the superintendents cared for, vvho in their opinions slighted consecration as a thing not necessary, as I have made appeare by the common Tenet of those dayes, by the statutes, and Acts, by the 25. Article of their ovvne Creed.

Your 6. and 7. Reasons taken from the diametricall opposition, which you pretend is betvveen this *Nagshead* story, and all the Records of England, are confuted, and retorted in the 3. Chap. And your 8. and 9. Reasons from the statute 8. Elizab. and the Register in the lives of the 70. Archbishops of Canterbury are also proved to be against yourselfe in the 2. and 3. Chapters.

## C H A P. VIII.

*The vvitnesses of the Nagshead story do exceed those of the fabulous Consecration at Lambeth, both in number, and in authority; and the constant tradition of the said story, doth manifest the forgery of M. Masons Register.*

I. **Y**Our tenth reason M. Doctor, against the *Nagshead* story, is taken from all sorts of Witnesses. You say M. *Mason reckoneth up seven of your writers, who had justified the legality of your Ordinations, and cited your Registers as authentique Records, before himselfe, wherof the first is Jewell.* How false this is, may be evident by *Jewells* answer to *Harding*, wherein he cites no Registers, though his adversary called for them expressly, *Shew vs your Registers.* As for your other Writers, they cited no authentique Registers, because they disagreed amongst themselves, and agree not with *Masons* newfound Records, which alone you allow for authentique. As for *Camdens* testimony it availeth litle both because he vvvas not so bold as to put downe a thing so disadvantageous to his Clergy and dangerous to himselfe as also because you cite not his first edition, which should have bin cited; for al-

Pag. 125.

Confut.  
Apol. fol.  
57. 59.  
edit. an.  
1566.

70 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

though I can not find it , yet I have found no small conjectures of knavery vsed in his other editions , as there hath bin with Stow, and others , this I am assured of, that *Cambden* for feare of displeasing others leit out sundry particulars well knowne to himselfe.

2. You produce some Catholiques , not as witnesses of your consecration at Lambeth, but as men convinced by protestant testimonies, and Registers. If this be true, it only proves, that yee never wanted forgers, and that we have some weake , and credulous brothers, which is but a very weake prooffe of your orders. The first of these, is one M. *Clerke*, who was (you say) an Actuary in Cardinal *Poole* his legative Court. This M. *Clerke* met with one M. *Higgins*, who had bin made a Catholique by reflecting vpon the Nagshead consecration , and M. *Clerke* approved well of his caution, because *in dubiis tutior pars sequenda*, indoubtfull matters we must follow the surest : but withall he wished, that what our Authors had written concerning that point, could be made good. For M. *Clerke* sayd that he himselfe was present , when the advocate of the Arches , whom the Queene sent to peruse the Register after the consecration , and to give her an account whether it was performed Canonically , returned her this answer, that *he had perused the Register, and that no just exception could be made against the Consecration*; But (he said) something might have bin better

„better, particularly that Corverdale was not in  
„his *Rochet*, but he assured her, that could make  
„no defect in the Consecration. This is your wise  
story, and your Author is one M. *Barwick*, who  
had it from M. Higgins.

3. I will suppose at the present, that there  
is such a man in the world, as this. M. *Barwick*,  
and that you do not feigne this story, as you do  
that of F. *Oldcorne*; but I must thinke it is no  
better then a fable, though I will not make you  
the Author, because it hath so many silly, and  
improbable circumstances. First that the *Queen*  
should send to peruse the Register after the  
consecration, to be informed whether it was  
performed Canonically. Her Majesty without  
doubt spared that labour, because she might  
have as particular, and a more impartial rela-  
tion from the Lords, and Courtiours that as-  
sisted (as the Register says) at the consecration,  
then from the Records. And if she doubted of  
the skill, or attention of her Courtiours, she  
might examine some of the Doctors that were  
present. Secondly, your story makes the *Queen*  
a very silly woman, that needed the assurance  
of the Advocate of the Arches, to settle her  
conscience, in so intricate a case forsooth, as  
the want of a *rochet* in a friar, at a Bishops  
consecration. Thirdly this story is proved to  
be feigned, by the Queens letters patents and  
commission; wherein her Majesty declares, that  
there was a necessity to dispense with Canons;  
how then could she doubt, and send the Ad-  
vocate of the Arches to give her an account,

## 72 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

whether the consecration was performed Canonically? A necessity of dispensing with the Canons, is cleere evidence that à consecration can not be Canonical; the Queene declared this necessity in her letters patents before the consecration was performed. Therefore she had cleere evidence that it could not be canonical. How then could she doubt of what was evident to herselfe? Or to what purpose should she send the Advocate of the Arches to resolve her of a doubt, which she could never entertaine? This is evidence enough to prove, that your story, good M. Doctor, is feigned. The only doubt remaining is, whether your selfe, or M. *Barwick* feigned it, which I leave to your consideration. But suppose it had not bin a fiction, all that can be concluded out of it, is, that M. Clerke confessed the Nagshead story was doubtfull, but so that the contrary wanted assurance, and therefore approved of M. Higgins caution. What advantage can this be to your cause, I do not understand; though every man doth see the prejudice it suffers by your stories, and pretended vindication, which is real and plaine prevarication. Would any men in earnest bring so weake testimonies in a matter of so great importance? doe you not make all the world see how litle you have to say to the point which is to make your succession vndoubted?

4. Your other witnes is one M. *Hart*, who was satisfied with *Parkers* consecration, when he saw copies of your Register. You may cite  
many

many other simple Catholiques that would believe the same; but that only proves their credulity, and cleeres not your Register from forgery. Yet this story we must believe vpon your word, wherein all they will have greate difficulty, that read in the 1. Chap. how falsely you accuse the Jesuits, and imprisoned Priests of acknowledging that *your Register was beyond exception*. Neither you, nor any other Writer of your Church, named a witresse for your fable of Lambeth, but one, towit, *Charles Howard* earle of Notingham, Lord Admiral of England, whose testimony M. Mason would not have valued at so high a rate, as to attribute his long life to a particular providence of God reserving him for the Vindication of your Clergy, unlesse he had bin in great want of others. But how doth he testify? Forsooth, he tould it a friend, and this friend tould it M. Mason, who put it in print. First I must question you whether the Earle was alive, when M. Mason printed his testimony. If he were, why did not M. Mason get a formal attestation as you have done? Jam sure yours have cost you more labour, and done you lesse service then that would have cost, or served him. was he dead? I see no more signes in this then in other occasions of Gods favourable providence to your Church. Will the Earles saying to a namelesse friend that he had bin at a banquet in Lambeth restore the credit of your Church deprived of lawfull Clergy vpon so many titles as have bin alleadged, and this man not speacke of what he had heard, till  
the

# 74 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

the Author was speechlesse, and in his grave? but the Earle told it to a friend. What friend? Why is his name concealed, and his relation printed, if it be not, that he neither hath name, nor being? You do not believe that *John Stow* related the story of the Nagshead to more then one friend because *D. Champney* doth not name them; and you exact from us to believe, that the Earle of Nottingham related the story of Lambeth to one friend, though you do not name him. Yet *John Stowes* friends had good reasons, why they would not be named by *D. Champney*, 'when your Clergy was so powerfull and spitefull in England; but what reason could the Earle of Notinghams friend have not to be named by *M. Malon*? Did he peradventure feare, that your Clergy would persecute him for endeavoring to maintaine their Orders and credit? do you not see *M. Doctor*, how ill grounded a fable this is of your first Bishops consecration at Lambeth, that you can not name for it one witnesse allowable; I doe not say, nor exact as you doe, according to the rigour of legal formality, but not so much as by the favour of ordinary probability.

5. You will find on the other side the Nagshead story much more credible, delivered to us by the tradition, and testimony of the most able persons of our Religion, and Nation. He who gainsaies it, may vpon the same score gainsay any thing, that is beyond the reach of his memory, or depends vpon the testimony of others. What ground hath any man to fix his  
beliefe



believe vpon, but a constant tradition, and testimony, of honest, and knowing persons? Its now à century of yeares since the Nagshead story happened; it hath bin constantly related, and credited by wise men, as a certaine truth, ever since the yeare 1559. It was never contradicted by any, untill it was imagined by our aduersaries, that their new Registers might contest with our ancient tradition, and make the Nagshead story seeme improbable, in the yeare 1613. of which no man doubted for the space of 52. yeares before. But they were mistaken because evident truths, though they relate absurd actions, can not, by any device or art, be made improbable, untill their evidence be blotted out of the memory of men. Time may wear out writings, and all other monuments, but tradition will last as long as men and time, it is a never decaying evidence, that makes any thing evidently credible, which hath not bin seasonably contradicted, when it mought, and ought to have bin done, especially if with much advantage, and litle difficulty.

6. That there hath bin these hundred yeares a constant tradition betweene sober, and wise men, of the Nagshead story, can not be denied by our Aduersaries, vnlesse they be resolved to say, that we Catholiques have had no sober, or learned men, since they left vs. I hope the Catholique Bishops, and Doctours of *Q. Maries* time, were sober and wise men; they believed this story, and recounted it to *Persons, Fitzherbert, D. Kellison, Holinwood,*

N

D. Champ-

## 76 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

D. *Champney, Fitzsimons &c.* Persons believed it, and recounted it as a serious truth to many, as is well knowne to F. *Henry Silifdon*, a man of known integrity, and truth, yet living. *Fitzherbert*, and the rest above named, gave so much credit to it, that they published it in print, as every one may see in their bookes.

Therefore this story is farre from being improbable, but is rather evident, as being supported by the credit, testimony, and tradition of most wise, and sober Authors, however so improbable it may seeme to somme, out of a Protestant zeale, or want of knowledge. But your maine argument against the evidence of this story, is, that all our Catholiques seeme to have it only from M. Neale. *Who told this to D. Bluet? Neale. Who told this to Haberley? Neale.*

Pag. 132.

*Who told it to the rest of the prisoners at Wisbich? Neale.* Only *Neale*. By your leave M. Doctor,

Pag. 32.

you forget your selfe, for, in an other place of your booke, you *acknowledge*, that M. *Constable* writ the story, and he is *one of our principall Authors*; but he sayes in his relation, (written when this story happened) that it was a thing without doubt, because not only M. *Neale*, but other Catholiques *integerrima fidei, of most intire credit*, were eyewitneses of Scorys ridiculous manner of consecrating *Parker*, and the rest in the Nagshead Taverne. Yet suppose that M. Neale had bin the only eyewitnesse of this action, I see nothing that followes more cleerly from such a supposition, then this conclusion. *Ergo* M. *Neale* must needs have

ieved have bin a person of very greate ingenuity , and  
 many integrity. Be pleased to turne , and frame your  
 many interrogations thus. Who believed M. Neale ?  
 wing D. Watson Bishop of Lincoln. Who believed  
 gave M. Neale ? D. Bluet. Who believed M. Neale ?  
 it in D. Haberley. Who believed M. Neale ? All  
 kes. the learned , and vertuous Priests , prisoners  
 pro- for their conscience at *Wisbich*. Who believed  
 por- M. Neale ? All the Catholiques of England.  
 on of The conclusion is. *Ergo* M. Neale was a man  
 im- that deserved great credit, otherwise you must  
 Pro- condemne the greatest heads amongst Catho-  
 your- quiques , for believing so odd a story , without  
 this any credible authority. M. Neale had bin a pro-  
 e to fessor in the Vniversity of Oxford , and forfei-  
 D. ted his chaire , and livelihood , for not taking  
 eale. the oath of supremacy : It is incredible that he  
 ich? would feigne such a story as that of the Nags-  
 tor, head , and therby engage the Catholique  
 e of Church to practise Reordination against our  
 Sta- known Tenets , and his owne conscience, and  
 ipal by such a relation , declare himselfe to be not  
 rit- only a virulent backbiter , but an impudent  
 as a Impostor.

M. 7. But now I must prove , that the Nags-  
 dei, head story is more then probable , not onely  
 rys for the quality of the persons reporting ; and  
 er, believing it , but also by the very circumstan-  
 Yet ces , or rather exigences of the time If you  
 ye- looke vpon the Church of England , as it was  
 ol. in the late Kings reigne , it will seeme impro-  
 on, bable that men should choose a Taverne for  
 eds an episcopal consecration : but if we consider

78 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

the straight passages through which the said Church was forced to march in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths reigne by reason of the notorius want it had of Bishops; it will not appeare strange unto vs, that the first protestant superintendents should go to a Taverne with intention to supply there the want of their Church, it being well knowne in those days, that neither Scory, nor Hadgkins, nor Coverdale, were consecrated Bishops. And though they had the Keyes of the Churches at their command, they had not the *Key of Order*, nor the command of the true Bishops hands, or tongues; therfore it was plotted, that old *Landasse* should be inveigled to give them a meeting in a Taverne, where with good words, and good cups they hoped to bring the old man to a good humour. But God gave him grace to abstaine from a second scandal, though himself had taken the oath of supremacy yet in his judgment he was à Catholique, and more sensible of B. *Bonnors* excommunication ready to be fulminated against him, then D. *Bramhall* would have his Reader believe. Now, if we will add to this necessity the principles, and inclinations of the persons that were to be ordeined Bishops, we shall find there was nothing in the circumstances of the Taverne consecration which makes it incredible; for, the persons were of the opinion then à la Mode, condemning consecration as a point not necessary for Ecclestical power, though not to be refused for publique satisfaction, and seeing no better could

could be had, they thought it more expedient to have something presently, which they might give out for Consecration, then to expect longer for their benefices, which was the buisnes they were about, and sought vvith all care, and speed to bring about.

8. I must returne once more to M. Neale, and complaine of your railing M. Doctor, against a learned, and honest man. You call him a *spie*, *brainsick foole*, &c. and despise his testimony, because he was not sworne; the crédit which as wise men as you, did give him, is an argument that he was no foole, and that he could well distinguish a Consecration dinner from an ordination; such a mistake doth not much misbecome a Protestant Courtier, as the Earle of Notingham was; but it can not be believed of such a Priest, and a Lector of the Univerſity of Oxford, as M. Neale. I remember when you tooke vpon you in *Bruges* to confirme some eminent persons of the English Court, many of the Courtiours were starled at so vnusual a ceremony, as your confirmation seemed to them, and were solicitous to know what it meant. Why should not the Earle of Notingham be as ignorant of a Protestant consecration, as the Courtiers of *Bruges* were of your ceremonious confirmation? Especially seing confirmation should be given to all, and therfore frequent, where as Consecration of Bishops happens seldome.

9, To M. Neale, and other Catholiques eye vvitnesses of your *Nagshend* consecration, cited

Fitz Simons in  
Britan.  
Pag. 317.

# 80 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

ted by M. *Constable*, may be added the testimony of all the Puritans. who say, *that the profane Order, and Ordination of Protestant Bishops in England, had its beginning, and progresse in a corner, not in a congregation.* I hope the Archiepiscopal Chappell of *Lambeth* is no corner; these words must allude to the *Nagshead Taverne* (for no other place is heard of but these two) and do prove that your Registers deserve no credit, but that they were forged in a corner. To the Puritans I will aggregate all your English Clergy in the beginning of K. James his reigne, when *Holiwood* printed, how D. *Alabaſter* asked of M. *Brancroft* pretended Bishop of London, how his first Superintendents *Parker, &c.* were consecrated? he answered, *that he hoped, in case of necessity a Priest might ordaine Bishops.* This answer demonstrates the truth of the *Nagshead* story, and the forgery of your Records: because all your Clergy did acquiesce to *Brancroft* answer, not one of them had a word to oppose against F. *Holiwoods* booke, and by their silence proved themselves our witnesses. *Qui tacet consentire videtur.*

10. Now M. Doctor, that we have produced the grounds, circumstances, and witnesses of the *Nagshead* story, and of your solemn consecration at *Lambeth*, let vs compare one with the other, that the Reader may judge, which of both ought to be credited. Our story of the *Nagshead*, is grounded vpon a constant tradition of a hundred yeares, betweene wise and

*Demon-*  
*ſtrat. diſ-*  
*ciplina*  
*cap. 8. ſ. 1.*  
*ſ. 2. pag.*  
*43.*

and sober persons ; which tradition can not be counterfeited, because no human industry can reach, or spread so farre, as to speake the same thing by so different mouthes, and interest, as there are amongst our witnesses, *Catholiques, Puritans*, and *Protestants*. But the ground of your protestant consecration at Lambeth, comes farre short of what yee intend to prove by it ; for, your ground is your Register, vvhich appeared not (being called for neere a hundred yeares ago) vntill the yeare 1613. And besides, it might be as easily counterfeited, as any other writing by one, or fewe hands without the concurrence, or conspiracy of so many hands, heads, and opposite interests, as would have bin necessary for the counterfeiting of one Tradition. So that as to the grounds of both stories, ours is the more credible.

II. As for circumstances, which must relate to the place, tyme, and persons, there is no doubt that our story hath the advantage. The place of your pretended consecration (Lambeth) vvas never named (even in your *Hannovv* Register) vntill 1613. Our story named the *Nagshead* Taverne from the beginning. As for the persons, their conscience, and religion ; we have also the better ; for you have seene how little in those dayes your religion valued Ordination, and your first Bishops conscience could make no scruple, to act, and receive in a Taverne, what they judged to be no act of religion. As for the danger of Pre-

## 82 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*munires*, or other penalties, they could not feare any; having in their comission an ample dispensation to do what they pleased against the Statutes, and Canons, as hath bin demonstrated in the 2. Chap. And finally the last circumstance, which is of time, and persons, doth so divide the relations of your writers, vvho speake of this consecration at Lambeth, that their contradictions are a sufficient proofoe of your forged records, because relations drawne out of true records can not vary in the names, and number of persons, in the month, or day, which of course are expressed with great exactnes. You can find no such contradictions in the *Nagshead* story.

12. But now let vs reflect vpon the number, and quality of the witnesses. Ours are not only *M. Neale*, but others of *most intire credit*, spectators of the *Nagshead* Consecration, as *M. Constable* writ in their owne life times, neere a hundred yeares ago; but yee never named any eyewitnesse but one, the Earle of Nottingham, eyther dead when he was cited, or if alive in a manner, and lesse credible then if he had bin dead. Our eye witnesses, related the story of the *Nagshead* to *D. Watson* Bishop of Lincolns, *D. Bluet*, *D. Haberley*, *M. Constable*, *John Stow*, to the Priests prisoners at *Wisbich*, &c. but your one witnesse never related the story of Lambeth to any that had a name, but only is sayd by *M. Mason*, to have told it to a namelesse friend. Our witnesses published the story of the *Nagshead* in the ve-



ry beginning as soone as it happened; but your Witnesse never published that of *Lambeth*, but told it privatly to a friend, as if forsooth, it had bin a secret, or a prejudice to his Church. The testimony of our witnesses agreeth with the principles of your reformation, with the 25. article of your religion, with your translations of scripture, with the statuts, 1. and 8. Eliz. 1. and with the confession of *Bancroft*, and the tacite consent of all your ancient Clergy of England; and with the publique testimony of all the Puritans in print, the testimony of your one Witnesse, and Records, are irreconcilable with the foresaid evidences. Now judge M. Doctor, who deserves most credit, one yong gallant (in case the earle ever shold have said what Mason pretends) invited to a banquet, or many knowing men, eyewitnesses of the fact? An ancient, and constant tradition of learned, and honest men, agreeable to your owne principles of religion, to the confession of your owne Doctors, ad to the statuts of the land; or a new-found Register, never cited, nor produced (though earnestly called for) untill the season, and occasion was past; diametrically opposite to your owne articles of faith, and to the principles of your Church, and to the evidence of your statuts. I hope that neither you, nor any other, will be so obstinate, as hereafter to preferre the relation of an obscure scrole, hidden for the space of 52. yeares, (the best, and greatest part of the age of your protestant Church) be fore the cleere, and publique tra-  
O dition

# 84 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

dition of so many eminent persons that related, and credited the Nagshead story. But in case that you, or any other of your communion, should not be perswaded by so evident reasons to a truth so credible, I must attribute your blind obstinacy to a most refined heresy, which not only depraves the will, and obscures the understanding, but also deprives men of common sense, and makes them walke, and wander in darknesse applauding, and extolling with as greate zeale, and as litle discretion, their invisible Records, as your protestant forefathers did their invisible Church.

13. And now M. Doctor, I believe you will pittie the late Kings misfortune, and wish that he had guien *way to the Parliament, to pull donne parliament Bishops*, who had neither human, nor divine right to temporal benefices, or spiritual offices. Though it be no pittie *that I was not of his Councell*, its greate pittie that he was not better informed of your Orders; had he bin pleased to advise, in time vpon this subject, your superficiall formality had never bin able, to roote out his posterity, of their well grounded right to three Kindomes. And truly if the Jesuits Colleges had no more right to the plate of their Churches, and revenues, then yee have to your bishoprickes, and benefices, I *would not crye out with Ploiden* (as you imagine) *the case is altered*; but would perswade them to restitution, and exhort you to the same, if this charitable office had not bin prevented by Divine justice, depriving your Clergy of what they

they so wrongfully possessed. Yet notwithstanding your miserable condition, you are pleased to say, that yee are our feare, and hate. We love your persons, hate your errours, wonder at your obstinacy, pardon your former cruelties, and present contumelies, pittie your misery, and much more your blindnes the cause of your misery: neyther enuy your talents, nor feare your power, but continually pray to the Father of mercies, that he may vouchsafe to enlighten your Clergy, and by them open the eyes of others misled by their errours.

---

C H A P. I X.

*My Lord Audleys testification upon oath of Mortons acknowledging the Nagshead ordination in Parliament. The reason of beleeving, and publishing the said testification, which upon due examination is much preferred before all others alleadged against it.*

1. **I** Am confirmed in my Lord *Audleys* evidence of D. *Mortons* speech granting the Nagshead ordination by the very ground you offer to him, and propose to others, to make credible a mistake: For, if my Lord had not bin well assured that there is none, he would have willingly layd hold of your courtesy, and of the speech, and person of the pretended

## 86 *The nullity of the Prelatike*

Bishop of *Lincoln*, who, (as you say) did once mention the fable of the Nagshead in a speech in  
 Pag. 26. *Parliament*, but with as much detestation of it, as your ancestors used to name the Devil. Why might not the mistake both of the person, and of the drift, or scope of his speech, be the occasion of this relation? To this interrogation my Lord *Audley* himselfe will give you an answer. But give me leave to aske of you, upon what occasion could *Lincoln* mention your Nagshead consecration in a speech in *Parliament* which might not as well have moved *Durham* to speake of the same? Once you grant speeches of this subiect in the vpper house, you can hardly free *D. Morton* from having a share in them.

Pag. 27. 2. But the greatest mistake of all others was (sayth the Doctor) to publish such a notorious untruth to the world, so temerariouly without better advise. I confesse that though I never doubted of the truth of my Lord *Audleys* relation, yet I did foresee that *D. Morton* would protest against it, and deny the story, as you do *D. Bancrofts*, concerning the same subject of the Nagshead. But it is a greate mistake in you to thinke, that this story of my Lord *Audleyes* was published temerariouly, and without consideration and designe. For, it was considered that either yee would deny it, or grant it. If yee granted *D. Mortons* speech, I had my intent. If yee denied it, and produced authentique certificats, and testimonies to disprove what was layd to his charge, your owne certificats, and authentique testimonies, would be cleer evidences of  
 the

the truth of the Nagshead story, though they should vindicate *D. Morton*. For, if the Nagshead story had not bin notoriously true, and evident in the beginning of *Q. Elizabeths* reigne, why did not your predecessours produce then authentique Records, or at least such Certificats, as you now do, of your pretended solemnity at *Lambeth*, when some evidence was desired of your first Bishops to cleere their consecrations, and the very Registers so earnestly called for? Why did not some of your Clergy of those days accuse *D. Harding* (as you do me) of *calumny, rashnesse, temerarious credulity* &c. For publishing, and objecting the *Nagshead* story? That yee were vpbraided by him for that ridiculous consecration, you may see in your Bishop *Goodvins* catalogue, whose words I cited. Why did they not make the like noyse when the puritans told them of the beginning of their Ordination in a corner, not in a Congregation. Are you more zealous for the honour of one *D. Morton*, then your former Bishops were for their owne credit, and the being of their whole Church? If they had not wanted matter, how could they want minde, or meanes to procure, and publish such testimonies of the Lords recorded to be present at the solemnity of *Lambeth*, as you have got of nine other Lords, members of the late Parliament? could they find no testimonies to stop the Puritans clamour? The truth is, the Nagshead story was too well knowne in those dayes to be called in question; and not only then, but even

# 88 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*Sacro-  
bos. Lib.  
de inve-  
stiganda  
Christi  
Ecclesia.  
Cap. 4. e.  
dit. 1603.*

in the beginning of King *James* his reigne, when *F. Holinwood* objected it in print an. 1603. to all your protestant Clergy, and confirmed it by the testimony and confession of *D. Bancroft* then living, being actually in place of Bishop of *London*. Yet no certificats appeared to contradict the story, or *Bancrofts* acknowledgment, none to convince the Puritans objection What reason could there be of this silence, and patience, but cleere evidence of what you now so confidently deny? so that you see *M. Doctor*, how this stir which you have made about *Mortons* vindication, doth prove the truth of your *Nagshead* Consecration, and that your certificats to disprove my Lord *Audleys* testimony, reflect vpon more then you did designe, or desire, and totally destroy the plea of your forged Registers. But let vs heare what he saith for himselfe in his ovne words.

„ Having scene a booke intituled the Con-  
„ secration, & Succession of Protestant Bis-  
„ hops, &c. & particularly perused that Chap-  
„ ter calld the Vindication of the Bishop of  
„ Durham I finde my self (reflecting of some  
„ expressions therein, & the Bishop of Derry  
„ author) obliged to say something as concer-  
„ ned, & so have desired place here for a few  
„ lines. Who the Author of the treatise of Ca-  
„ tholique faith, &c. fixeth on to prove his al-  
„ legations touching the Bishop of Durhams  
„ speech, I know not, for he told me of it befo-  
„ re ever I spoke to him, but sure I am, if it  
„ be

„ be looked after he may have sufficient testi-  
„ mony to satisfy half a dozen juries; but that  
„ which stirs me to speake in this matter, is, a  
„ note I have at the request of the Bishop of  
„ Derry given him vnder my hand, wherein,  
„ I say in substance the same with the Author  
„ touching the Bishop of Durhams speech, as  
„ for the booke against Episcopacy, which was  
„ the ground of the discourse, my note only  
„ avers it was brought into the howse, but  
„ said not by whome, nor who was the author,  
„ in truth I wondered much to finde that the  
„ Bishop of Durham doth deny this speech, for  
„ I can not remember that ever I heard of, or  
„ read the story of the *Nagshead*, till that day  
„ in Parliament of my Lord of Durham; then  
„ I heard it from him, and this I say, as I shall  
„ answere it before the judgement seat of  
„ God Almighty. And I doe not remember  
„ that ever I heard the Bishop of Lincolne,  
„ or any other Bishop before, or since mention  
„ the *Nagshead*, or touch that story: if I had,  
„ & not named him, my Lord of Durham  
„ mought have just reason to complaine, but  
„ my Lord of Derry will not beleieve that I  
„ (for I can not but take it to my self) doe, or  
„ ever did know the Bishop of Durham, so  
„ well as to sweare this was the man. If his  
„ Lordship had bin an English Bishop, an fre-  
„ quented Parliaments, he would have omit-  
„ ted this. Not to multiply vvordes. I can as-  
„ sure his Lordsp, I could as well, & surely ha-  
„ ve sworn this is the man, the Bishop of  
„ Dur-

90 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

„ Durham, as his Lordship could of Sir *Geor-*  
 „ *ge Ratclif* when he lived. Besides, his per-  
 „ son, & place of the Bishops bench is too  
 „ eminent to be mistaken. An other expres-  
 „ sion of my Lord of Derry is, I do not take  
 „ my self to be so exact Analyser of a discour-  
 „ se, as to be able to take my oath, what vvas  
 „ the true scope of it. Here likevvysse I must  
 „ beg his Lordships pardon. I knowv no such  
 „ defect in my self, for there is not any thing  
 „ more easy then to comprehend the true co-  
 „ pe of a short a plaine Historicall discourse as  
 „ this was; to conclude, as to the Bishop of  
 „ Durhams denial, I hope that confessing  
 „ him self novv of the age of 95. yeares, it  
 „ vvill be held no crime to say, or impro-  
 „ bable, to beleve that one of that grear a-  
 „ ge, may at least forget, vvhat he spake so  
 „ many yeares since. For the tvvo certficats of  
 „ the other Lords, that of the temporall faith  
 „ litle to my Lord of Derrys purpose, nei-  
 „ ther with an indifferent judgment can that  
 „ of the spirituall worke much. For my part,  
 „ I doe not say, that any, or all their Lords-  
 „ hips, whose names are put to the certficats  
 „ in the booke, were in the Howse at this ti-  
 „ me, or if any of them were, that they rooke  
 „ notice of what my Lord of Durham spake,  
 „ for many discourses are made in Parlements,  
 „ & litle notice taken of them, neither had I,  
 „ of this, but that it was to me a new thing.  
 „ The Clarke of the Parliament is allso  
 „ brought in to certify, though as to my note  
 „ his



his paines mought have bin spared, for I doe  
 „ not mention a booke presented, and conse-  
 „ quently none to be recorded, and as for  
 „ speeches, I doe assure his Lordship, in the  
 „ authority of an old Parliament man, that it  
 „ is not the office of the Clarke to recorde  
 „ them (his worke would be too great) till it  
 „ be a result or conclusion, & then he writes  
 „ them downe as Orders, Ordinances, &c. of  
 „ Parliament. I vvill end this short, & faith-  
 „ full defence, which I have bin here necessi-  
 „ tated to make for my self vvith many thanks  
 „ to my Lord of Derry for his charity, &  
 „ opinion of my ingenuity: & seing his Lords-  
 „ hips inclination in this matter is to absolve  
 „ me from a malicious lye, I vvill absolve my  
 „ self as to the mistakes either in the person,  
 „ or matter, assuring his Lordship, & all the  
 „ vvorld there is none.

3. Though this relation, and testimony gi-  
 ven by my Lord *Audley* doth not only cleere  
 me from casting any aspersion vpon *D. Monton*,  
 but also makes the whole speeche layd to his  
 charge, sufficiently credible, (one positive  
 witnesse with such circumstances proving more  
 then many negative, and it being more proba-  
 ble, that *D. Morton*, or any other in the Par-  
 liament, should forget, then my Lord *Audley*.  
 feigne such a story, without any possible desig-  
 ne or profit) yet I must vindicate my selfe from  
 the note of credulity, rashnesse, overmuch confi-  
 dence, and formal calumny fixed vpon me by *D.*  
*Bramhall*, for believing my Lord, *Audley*, and

92 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*pag. 26.* publishing his relation. Is it credulity or rashness, good M. Doctor, to believe a person of honour, and of so great ingenuity, *as you confesse my Lord Audley to be* and no man of honour can deny in a matter, wherof he had as cleere evidence, and hath as perfect memory, as is possible for any man to have of any object, by the acts of his senses, and understanding. He protesteth before God and man, that he never heard any thing of the *Nagshead* consecration till then, and that the novelty of the story, made him very attentive; that he remembers the individual circumstances of the place where D. *Morton* stood, his posture, and all other actions, wherwith he accompanied his speech: and that after D. *Morton* had finished the same, he asked a Lord of knowne reputation and wisdom, whether the first protestant Bishops had bin ordained in a Taverne? and that he answered, the story of the *Nagshead* was very true.

4. Now M. Doctor, I beseech you to consider, how impossible it is, that he should be mistaken, having such assurance of his attention, and of the evidence of his senses, and understanding? Want of memory (the only thing is, or can be objected to make roome for a mistake in this matter) may occasion doubts, and perplexities; but not cause such positive assurances, and cleere evidences as my Lord *Audley* to this howre retaines. If it be once granted, that men of judgment may be mistaken in the evidence they sweare to have of their owne perfect remembrance, and understanding,

standing, concerning an object cleerly acted before their eyes, and distinctly conveyed into their eares, and particularly reflected vpon, and immediately discoursed vpon, you may perswade all the world, that whatsoever they have seene, heard, and understood, are but dreames, and mistakes, occasioned by want of memory. for to impute so much dulnes, and ignorance to my Lord of *Audley*, that he could not comprehend the scope of a speculation so abstracted, so sublime, so Metaphysical, as *Mortons*, saying his forefathers were made Bishops in a Tarverne: this were enough to degrade a Doctor of Divinity, and dispend your episcopal pen from its endles, and senseles function of scribbling, if you held these titles vpon science, conscience, or common sense. This is to charge both the Relator, and Reader with plaine stupidity. Must men be made out of their wits, because they beare witnes against your Clergy? Or can you hope that any man in his wits will heed what you write, when you care so little what the Readers judge of you, and your writings?

5. But here comes a full tide of testimonies, to bring him of the sand he stuck himself in. Nine Peeres have bin so vexed with your importunity, that they have condescended to yield you som succour in so urgent necessity. *We doe* Pag. 23.  
*hereby testifie, and declare that to the best of our present knowledge, and remembrance, no such booke against Bishops as is there mentioned was presented to the house of Peeres in that Parliament,*

94 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

*and consequently that no such speech as is there pretended was, or could be made by him, or any other against it.* Jam far from calling in question the ingenuity of these honorable persons, or imputing unto them the want of incapacity to comprehend the scope of what *Morton* then said; or of any thing he ever could have said, if it had any scope; but I must call your judgment in question for thinking that what you have got will serve your turne. If it doe not its not their fault in giving what you asked, but yours in asking you knew not what. The question is, whether *Morton* acknowledged in parliament the *Nagshead* merry meeting; but whether it were vpon occasion of a booke publickly presented, or privatly delivered, whether dedicated to the parliament, or distributed amongst the members of Parleмент, whether in this man, or that mans name, whether Lord, or not Lord, what imports it to the matter in hand? There are none of these Lords, will deny, or doubt, but that many by-speeches have bin made by Bishops in Parliament vpon lesser occasions, then these I rehearsed, and perhaps some with no occasion, and also to no purpose at all, unles the rest have bin more carefull in speaking then you in printing. You confesse a booke to have bin *dedicated* to the Parliament against Episcopacy, and the booke to have bin writ by a Lord; you confesse *to have heard that the B. of Lincolne did once mention the fable of the Nagshead in a speech in Parliament*; and you will not deny, but that Durham for his many writings,

Page. 10.

Page. 26.

writings, and great age might have bin as fit, and forward to talke as another, and if you looke but upon the text of the testimony, you have begged, you find not a word that argues, or intimars his not having avowed the Nagshead ordination. They only say they remember *no such booke*, to wit with all the circumstances mentioned, and consequently no speech *against it*. They may remember a speech vpon occasion of a booke, wherein Durham took harbour in the *Nagshead* Tarverne, and yet say with truth they do not remember that speech, or any other to have bin made against such a booke signed with all those individual particularities. And further there might have bin such a speech, and such a booke, and such circumstances: and yet they might have forgot them all, or in part, after so many years; but I need not this, for they do not deny to remember the speech, nor the booke, nor any circumstance belonging to the point, we dispute. And I marke their attestation to be couched in termes so precise, and cautious, as both to content you, who presume to make any thing serve your purpose, and yet neither to contradict, nor wholly conceale the truth. For, those that with so carefull attention tyed their attestation so fast to the circumstantial part of the buisnes, knew fullwell that the attentive Reader would therby perceave they could have said more of the substance; if they had not bin by themselves, or by others persuaded that it was not convenient to

96 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

publish all they remembred. But your adding the Clark of the Parliaments testimony is a meere childish simplicity, what sayth he? *I do not find any such booke presented, nor any entery of any such speech made by B. Morton.* Will you make men beleewe that every speech is entered, or that if just such a booke was not formally presented, that the speech was not made vpon occasion of a booke, or that a booke in good English may not be said to be presented, although it be not deliured in such solemnity, as requires the putting it vpon record? It is much want that brought you doune to such beggarly shifts, to go from dore to dore begging attestations about an inconsiderable circumstance, and make soo poore, and pittifull vse of what you have scraped toge ther. You forget to beg the favour of your aduersary to let you talke disparatas in this desperat case, and beg pardon of your Reader for abusing his patiēce, and presuming that he is void of common sense, and no less reason you have to beg pardon of your partners for your want of ability, or Perhaps fidelity in the defence of the common cause. If you were a lawyer by profession, as you professe here much skill to litle purpose in law matters, I beleewe after such pleading as this, you would get few clients, and smal fees.

6. Put the case your Brother *Durham* had bin accused of treason, and you were allowed to plead for him (which equity in other countries is not denied) now there comes in a wit-

nes

nes whose ingenuity you grant, and no man can deny, he takes vpon his oath, as he hopes to be saved, that he heard the said *Durbam* vpon occasion of a sedicious pamphlet, make a speech to the people, wherin he exhorted them to deliver vp a towne to the enemy; that he knowes the man accused as vvell as you knew Sir *George Ratcliffe*; that he remembers cleerly the very place, and posture, wherin he made the speech, and further more that the speech was so vnexpected, that it made him in a particular manner attentive, that immediately after, he discoursed vpon it with an other, to informe himself better of the ground of that speech, and all this he protests over, and over againe in all occasions offered, as he is to answer in the day of judgment. Put the case further he should say that he thinks the pamphlet was writ by such a man, or given in such a mans name, and that it was presented by one, that made a leg as he gave it, and delivered it with his right hand; but of these petty circumstances he gives no assurance vnder his hand, as being things he made no very particular account of, or reflexion vpon. Now enters *M. Bramhall* the lawyer pufte vp vvith presumption that he can talke all the world out of their wits, and senses, First bragging, and vapouring, and threatening no lesse then convincing demonstrations, then vpbraiding his adversary with credulity, temerity for taking notice of such a testimony, and forewarning him wirth a most passionate zeale of his credit, hereafter

98 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

hereafter to turne stoick with *Epictetus*, and learne to distrust, and having wearied himself, and others with these Preambular impertinences, and disposed all by his presumption, and passion not to beleeeve a word he shall say, atlength he comes close to the point, and tels the judge, that the witnesse doth not take himself for so exact *Analysers* of a discourse, as to vnderstand what is meant by these words, *to deliver a toune to the enemy*, and if this be not sufficient to cleere the matter, he produces a writing wherein some persons say noe more, but that they doe not remember after 17. or 18. yeares such a Pamphlet, that is writ by such a man, and delivered with that ceremony, and in such a mans name, and consequently no speech to have bin made against it, as is pretended, and that it was not in such manner presented, as those are, which are noted in publicke Registers, but as to the effect of the speech not so much as a negative testimony, not so much as a word signifying it to be not remembred, but rather the contrary: otherwise they had spoken home to the substance, and not confined their oblivion within a few circumstances, and those nothing conducing to what is in question. But if the said lawyer should not so much as prove that the witnesses produced by him were present at the foresaid speech, nor give any reason, or conjecture why they said nothing towards the denial of the speech it self, in case they had bin present, but only of their having forgot certaine

tain  
reg  
tra  
pre  
test  
der  
the  
mer  
and  
and  
oth  
pro  
law  
raig  
say  
wou  
clee  
voc  
ran  
disc  
7  
I fa  
leg  
his  
aga  
ce.  
ten  
him  
no  
Mi  
cial  
as  
of



taine accidental superfluous particularities, not regarded, or formally avouched by the contrary witnes; nor alleadge any Law, Custom, president, or argument, why such a negative testimony of the not remembrance of inconsiderable circumstances should prevaile against the plaine, cleere, positive, vndoubted remembrance of a witnes beyond all exception: and further should presse his adversary ever, and anon to legal proofes, and admit of no others, and yet himself insist chiefly vpon a proof against the law of all nations that have law, to wit vpon the denial of the person arraigned, and others equally concerned; if, I say, a Lawyer should plead in this manner, would any judge, or any man of judgment cleere the Delinquent of treason, or the Advocate of treacherous prevarication, or ignorant presumption vpon so frivolous, and idle discourse.

7. And yet this is your case, M Doctor, this, I say, or worse then this; for besides your illegal plea of producing *Morton* as a witnes in his owne cause opposing a negative testimony against a positive; and that of the circumstance, this of substance, and his fellow Superintendents as much concerned in this matter as himself, who, if this story be confessed, have no more character, or order, then a Brownist Minister, or *Tubpreacher*, yet there is a special exception against the person of *Morton*, as having bin often, and evidently convicted of most plaine wilfull, vnexcusable lies, and

Q

im-

100 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

impostures in his severall writings concerning Religion, which shamefull abominable practise he hath vsed when he was less concerned, then in this present occasion. Whether I speake with reason, or passion the Reader will shortly judge of himself, and with all what exception may be taken against his Colleagues. I shall give neyther him, or you any names though provoked by both, he calls me *an impudent libeller*, you call M. Neale *a brainesicke foole*. I know you are both; as vvell versed in Civility, as Divinity, and need not to take you for my Maisters, or Paternes. But I shall teach the Reader to frame a right notion of you, and your tribe, and remit the giving you names to his discretion.

As to the Noblemen you cited, I have examined their attestation with that regard, as neyther to give offence to them, nor advantage to you, nor prejudice to the truth. To whom I make bold to present this humble petition that they will be pleased in their wisdom to consider the difference betwixt these two consequences, which without any artificiall Logique is easily discerned.

8. The first. I remember cleerly, and distinctly to have heard such a speech, which the attention to it, the admiration of it, the reflexion vpon it hath deeply imprinted in my memory, therefore I may securely say, and sweare such a speech y<sup>e</sup> have heard. The second. I doe not remember after 17. or 18. yeares certaine occasional circumstances of such a speech,

speech, or perhaps not the speech it self, because I might have bin absent, or not attentive to it, or made litle account of it. Therefore another mans perfect remembrance is not to be credited. Although the Roman Senatour *Hortensius* is renowned for his prodigious memory, yet I could never heare any thing of him which might give occasion to thinke that if he had forget something belonging to a speech made in the senate 17. yeares before, that his oblivion would have bin thought sufficient to voyd the evidence of it drawne from the solemne oath, and perfect remonstrance of a lawfull witnes. And albeit *Mithridates* could give account of every souldiers name in his army, yet if one had bin proved by the oath of a person of honour to have served him in his warres, can any man imagin the King would have disavowed his service, because after 17 yeares he, or some others had forgot his name? Not many yeares since there appeared a dim Comet observed by fevv, yet I could never find any that hath pervsed their observations so mad, as to call it in question, because he or some others can not call to memory the sight of it, notwithstanding a perfect remembrance they might have had of their being abroad that very night it is said to have bin seen by others.

9. But you M. Doctor, advance not so far as to evince the presence of your witnesses, much less their speciall attention, reflexion,

Q 2

ad-

admiration, or the like, which are the foundations of a lasting memory, for my witness doth not mention the day. Wherefore it was a worke not only of supererogation; but superfluity, that your superintending Brethren should put in their attestation, that they sate in the Parliament begun at Wesminster the 3. day of Novemb. 1640. without giving some signe of their sitting, or standing in Parliament the time of the speech. Yet *Mortons* attestation is not only superfluous, but ridiculous. A man that hath bin publickely, manifestly, and frequently convicted of most wilfull, and most impudent lyes in his writings, is grovne so forgetfull not only of what he spoke, but of what any man in his wits ought to speake, that he delivers himself in these terms. *I could never have made such a speech as is there pretended (and the prooffe it excellent) seeing y have ever spoken according to my thoughts, and always believed that fable of the Nagshead consecration to have proceeded from the father of lyes.* A deafe man might as well say, he heard it with his heeles, as that *Morton* should say he spoke according to his thoughts, when he thought it convenient to speake otherwise. And no lesse ridiculous industry was vsed in procuring a publique Notary, and five witnesses to make men believe that the attestation is truly his owne, not falsly fathered vpon him, for no body doubted but he would give a most ample testimony for himself, and his cause, but no man that knowes him by his writings vvill  
give

give credit to any thing he sayeth in behalfe of religion. Perſuade the old man that you have found a new trick to make better uſe of of the *Nagshead* consecration, then that of Lambeth, you shall have him, with double number of witnesses avow the speech, he hath disavowed. For is it credible he feares a fevv private mens silent censure, who hath hardened his face against the publicke reproach of as many schollers as read bookes of controverſy? But I shall present him, and his fellowes to your eyes, in their owne glasse, that you may know them better by sight then by hearſay.



## AN APPENDIX.

*Of the wilfull , and shamefull falsifications , and falsities of Protestant Ministers.*

I require no gentle , and courteous , nor so much as impartial, and unpassionate readers, I am content with any partiality, or passion, provided that it doe not wholly deprive them of the use of their eyes , and reason. I give but a scantling , and that in haste , and out of such bookes I had at hand , and what I found with little seeking. I am so assured by my owne experience of the plenty of this kinde of ware , promiscuously to be found in the prime Protestant writers , particularly in the English Nation, that I fear no other reproach, but of my sparing paines in collecting no greater heapes of this abominable filth , to cause thereby a wholesom, though noysom detestation of that Religion, which is vpheld by so vnchristian , vnhumane, Diabolical Policy. I begin with *Morton*.

In a virulent , and calumnious pamphlet intituled. *A discovery of Romish doctrine in case of conspiracy , and rebellion* pag. 4. he alleageth as an ancient decree out of Gracian. *Causa 15. qu. 6. c. 40. Si iuravi me soluturum alicui pecuniam qui excommunicatur , non teneor ei solvere :*

first it is no decree either of Pope, or Councel, but only words of the glosse; secondly it is an objection, not the resolution of the glosse, for it resolves that he is bound to pay, and proves it by divers lawes, and reasons.

In his treatise calld *a confutation of the Popes Supremacy, as supream head of rebellion* pag. 2. he affirmeth that in the old testament the Jesuits are forced to allow that the king was supream head of the Church in spirituall affaires, and ordering Priests, and for prooffe citeth Salmeran. d. 12. in ep. Pauli in gen. 8. sed contra. Where he doth not only cleerly hold, but largely prove the quite contrary, and solves the objections, and further ads that in case it had bin so in the old, it doth not follow that it is so in the new.

In his reply, and full satisfaction concerning the charge against Protestants for rebellion &c. pag. 3. he imputeth to *Vasques*, that he holds a man may be an heretique though he be not obstinate, wheras in the very disputation mentioned; *Vasques* guieth this definition of heresy, commonly received. *Heresis nihil est aliud, quam error in rebus fidei cum pertinacia*, and it is impossible that *Morton* should have bin ignorant of this notion of heresy; so frequently taught, and generally received, and by *Vasques* expressly. Disp. 126. c. 3.

In the same booke pag. 38. *Morton* feigneth that divers Catholique authors hold that *Popes cannot possibly be heretiques as Popes, nor for the conclusion, and consequently cannot be deposed.*  
among

# 106 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

among these, he brings *Bellarmin*, and *Gratian*, though *Bellarmin* directly teach that the Pope may be an heretique, and therupon deposed by the Church, or rather *is ipso facto deposed*, and may be so declared by the Church, and citeth the very canon of *Gracian*, saying *hereticum Papam posse judicari, expresse habetur Can. si Papa* dist. 40. *Morion* citeth *Azor* for the same l. 5. c. 14. & *Valentia* analy: l. 8. c. 3. and *Salmeron*. Cam. in *Galat*: 2. d. 24. and *Canus* de locis l. 6. cap. 8. and *Stapleton doctrin*. l. 6. initio. And *Costerus* de Pontif. in *Ench*. c. 3. and yet all these in the very places teach plainly, and flatly the very contrary. And further he is not ashamed to ad that these authors confirme their doctrine by the universall consent of Romish Devines, and Canonists for the space of 100. yeares, whereas they boath teache the contrary, to wit, that the Pope may be heretique, and deposed, and innumerable others of that age, true it is that God neyther hath, nor will permit, that any Pope, though heretique in his private opinion should by publique decree *ex cathedra* define any heresy, neither, for any thing wee know out of history well examined, can it be convinced that any Pope hitherto hath bin an heretique in his private persuasion, albeit in this point there be different opinions, which nothing at all belong to the present purpose.

But I must invite the reader, at least for a pleasant entertainment, if no higher motive can induce him, to peruse *Mortons* discourse against



against Æquivocation, and confer it with the answer contained in a booke intituled *A treatise tending to Mitigation*, it will be no smale sporte, I do not say, to catch him napping in ignorant mistakes, but to heare rapping loud lies one after an other, in that very booke where he detesteth Æquivocation, and professeth a most religious precisenes in point of truth. For example, he citeth Azor. l. 11. instit. cap. 4. quite contrary to this meaning, patching words to geather, that were spoken seperatly, and to an other end, and falsly translateth in to English that very text of Azor. which himself citeth in the margen. The words in latin are, *Si venit ex loco aliquo peste minimè infecto, qui falso habetur pro infecto*. Which Morton turnes thus into English, *if he com from a place infected*. But truely translated make the case wholly different, and are these, *if he came from a place not infected, which falsely is held to be infected*. But he is not only content to be convicted of vnexcusable falsehood by men that study moralists, but even by schoolboys, that read Tullies offices, in his 90. page he doth so grossely pervert the sense, change the words, and distroy the whole drift of Tullies discourse l. 3. offic. 9. *Regulus* and 9. *sed si*, that it is a wonder to see what impudensy growes from a custom of lying. These are but a few examples of the many detected by the aforesaid Treatise of Mitigation, and an other called *A quiet, and sober reckoning with Thomas Morton* by the reading wherof, and conferring each particu-

108 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

lar with the bookes cited every one may in a short time, and no great trouble judge by his eyes whether I have reason to except against such a witnes in his owne cause, and what reason there is to follow so wilfully, and wickedly blind leaders.

But I cannot but wonder at one circumstance, that after *Morton* had gained reputation by this practise, he was promoted to the title and profits of a Bishopricke, purchasing by a new kind of simony, not with buying, but with lyeing, a rich benefice. If *Bellarmin*, or *Perron* could have bin convicted of this false, and base proceeding either before, or after their Cardinals caps, what a noyse would have bin, when we heare such a clamour, vpon that which is not proved, but only pretended to be a credulous mistake? Yet when I consider *John Foxes* Acts, and Monuments, the very Magazin of no lesse malicious, then ridiculous lies, to have got so honorable a place in Protestant Churches, and that not by vulgar simplicity, but by publick authority, not by connivence, or negligence, but vpon designe, and by command: when I see this abomination hath stood so long in the holy place, I wonder no more at *Mortons* promotion, nor at whole Nations deceived by *Mahomets Alcoran*. If I should insist vpon the number of those, that by commaund, or concurrence are guilty of the falsehood of Foxes booke, I should accuse many more, then I am by this present occasion obliged; but the Ministers I cannot excuse vpon

upon any title, for although they be of meane learning, and no extraordinary reading, yet the falities are so numerous, and obvious, that it is impossible but many should have fallen under the observation of most. And by the booke of the three Conversions of England, and the Examen of Foxes Calender, which have bin printed almost threescore yeares since; and have come to the hands of many Protestant Ministers, this Foxes fowle worke hath bin so plainly discovered, that those, who have seen it, if they had least zeale, or love, or care of truth, ought to have informed their Brethren, and not to have permitted any Christian Religion to be longer prophaned with so publick a flaunder, and shame of Christianity. Should a renegade Captive tell his maister, that the sect amongst Christians, which he had bin taught, was maintained by such false, and shamfull practises, he would easily gaine Credit of a true Profelitte turned Turke upon conscience, and not convenience. I need not set downe *Foxes* impostures, for you shall see them in the forsaide bookes so grosse, and thick set one by another, that it will be harder to make a way through them, then find the way to them. I will passe my word the Author does him no wrong, and the reader upon his owne examination will take my word in an other occasion.

But to returne to *Morton* now with a white Rochet on his backe, but with as little ingenuity, and candour of mind as before. The imposition of those unhallowed hands hath not

110 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

imprinted the least marke of grace in his soule, or shame in his forehead. In the grand imposture writ by him then B. of Cov. and Lichf. pag. 85. edit. 2. he sets doune a large, and lying description of the Inquisitions crueltie, and addes, *So your Authour*. And who do you thinke is this Author, but *Cornellius Agrippa* a Magitian, as himself confesseth of himselfe? And where doth he write what heer is alleaged against vs? In a booke condemned by our Church. Not a word of these circumstances; but only that he is our Author, to make the Reader believe he is one we have no reason to except against. You had better take him to your selfe: for his blacke art is of the same colour with yours, and taught by one maister, who esteems you the better scholler, having done more mischief with your false jugling, then Agrippa with his conjuring. Now pag. 388. the same jugling trick over againe. Marke the ensuing words. *Els why is it that your owne Thuanus speaking of this separation (Viz of Luther) sayd that some in those days layd the fault upon the Pope Leo? More fully your Cassander, an Author selected in those days by the King of the Romans, as the chiefeſt divine of his.* And pag. 385. He calls Thuanus *our noble Historian*. Who knows nothing of Thuanus but by this mans relation, would take him to be, not only a sound unsuspected Catholique, but of special regard amongſt vs: wheras both our common opinion, and his owne Annals prove him a Hugonot. But besides falsely reporting him for a Catholic, he

## Clergy of England.

III

is plainly falsified in these very places alleaged. In the first he speaks not of Luthers separation, but of the election of Prelats in France; and in the 2. where he speaks of benefices, *Morton* makes him speake of Indulgences, in both places evidently against his cleere words, which read as they stand in *Thuanus* have not the least shadow of ambiguity. But the makeing *Cassander* ours, and our chiefeest Devine being listed in our Index of forbidden bookes amongst the Heretiques of the first ranke, and his owne writings accusing him, not only of the general heresies of these times, but of others also particular to himself, is not only a shamles, but senseles imposture. It is a labour too loathsome to dig any longer in this filthy dunghil of corruptions. And it is a madnes in any man that already knowes *Morton* by his notoriously impudent lying bookes, or before he take knowledge of him vpon this admonition to give the least credit to any thing he shal say, write, signe, or sweare concerning Religion, as being convicted by his owne writings to have lost all remorse of conscience, all feare of reproach from men, or punishment from God. Did he believe there is a God who hath prepared a Hel of torments for those, who maintaine a division in the Church by so many wilfull impostures, and seriously intended to prevent the scourge of his heavy hand, could he stand gazing vpon his grave at so nigh a distance without repenting, or can he truly repent without recanting. Be not amazed that he remains without feeling,

## 112 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

for, no *Pharaos*, no *Antiochus* pride, and cruelty doth so harden the hart of a Reprobate as a long custome of denving, and belying the known truth, which *Morton* hath done for many yeares. For, albeit his blindnes were so great as not to see the manifest truth of our Religion, yet impossible it is, he should not see the false calumnies, false translations, and false allegations he bringeth against our Authors, whome he hath read with his owne eyes. Let any man marke his manner of perverting them, he shall cleerly perceave that it could not be so done without haveing seene the very places, and read them at leasure.

But this hath bin the continual practise of defenders of heresy in all ages, and in this last age, and in English writers, and in the most eminent of them most conspicuous. Let the reader, who desirs to be satisfied in this point, procure, as he may easily, the forenamed treatise tending to mitigation, where in the 12. chap. he shall find the prime Protestant writers in the begining of *Q. Eliz.* reigne, and in the first place *Jewel* called B. of Salisb. guilty of most enormous, unexcusable untruths. He shal heare this impudent Minister bragging, and braving that we cannot alleadge *one Author, one Doctor, one sentence, no not two lines* in behalf of any one of the 28. articles he attributeth to vs, wherein are contained the real presence, private Masse, images, the Popes primacy, offering vp of Christ in sacrifice, common prayer in a strange language &c. Whether we have sufficient

cient authority for these Tenets is not the present question; but whether we cannot find one ancient Doctor, or two lines in favor of any one of them. He shall heare him cite S. Austin as allowing mariage after vowes made of chastity in his booke *de Bono viduitatis* the drift of which booke being wholly, and plainly to the contrary. He shal heare him cry downe another S. Austin the Apostle of Engl. not only against the authority of ancient History, but even against the confession of *John Foxes Acts, and Monuments*. He shal heare so much, that he will not need to goe further to Seeke *Harding*, and others, who have at large discovered the false lustre of this counterfeit *Jewel*, this pretious stone layd in the fundation of the English Babilon. He'shal find the like false dealing of *Casshill, Clarke, and Perkins*. As for John Foxe the Reader after a short tast of his knavery is remitted to the third part of the three conversions of Engl. wherein one chap. are sett downe severally above a hundred and twenty wilfull lyes, vttered by *Foxe* in less then three leaves of his Acts, and Monuments, and those such, as no ways may be excused, eyther by ignorance, or error; but must needs proceed from voluntary fraud, and malice, himself knowing that it was false, which he related. I omit what is further alleadged of malicious fraud in the writings of Sir *Francis Hastings*, and Sir *Edoard Cooke*, but a word I must ad of Sir *Philip Plessis Mornay* a frenchman, to shew that it is not a national inclination of the English, but of any nation

# 114 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

nation infected with heresy to maintaine heretical errours with voluntary falshood. The french Janfenists of late make good my assertion, and this french Calvinist will make it better. In a booke of his full of authorities against the Masse, he was charged by Peron, then B. of *Eureux*, after Cardinal, with five hundred wilfull falsifications, and vpon suite made to *Henry* the fourth by the said *Peron* it came to a publick trial in presence of the King of France, and great part of his Nobility on the 4. of May 1600. Of these five hundred were exhibited threescore to *Plessis* to take his choise for the first dayes tryall, who tooke nineteene of those, which he thought himself best able to excuse. Now the straitnes of time permitting only nine to be examined, he was both by his owne Protestant Judges, and the Catholick Judges on the other side condemned of falsification, and untrue dealing in all nine, after he had bin permitted to say what he could in his defence. And *Peron* further pressed him to returne to the like trial of the rest of the five hundred, but *Plessis* could not be brought to it. This publique trial is largely related, and defended in the end of the first tome of the 3. part of the three Conversions of England, and appeares in the Kings owne letter in print, as also by the publick Acts set forth by the approbation of the said King and his counsel.

If I should proceed on with the vnchristian, and vnhuman proceeding of our English Ministers in their shamfull calumniations, and falsifications,



fications, it wold be an endles worke. I shall remit the reader to a booke intituled a search made into matters of Religion by *Francis Walsingham* Deacon of the Protestant Church before his change to the Catholick, where he may find such foule dealing of so many English Protestant Ministers, *Bel, Doves, Jewel, Sutclif* &c. that with conferring the places by his owne industry he will never need to informe himself more by the relations of others. Let him but read the Discussion of *D. Barlows* answer togeather with the suplemēt, and adjoynder, he shall know the lying spirit of *Barlow, Reynolds, Dunnes*, and *Andrewes*, and this mans not only falsities, but follies in his answer to Card. *Bellarmines* Apollogy. *Infelix puer, atque impar Achilli*. I cannot conceive what excuse a Protestant that hath any sense of Religion can alledge why he should not endeavour to rectify his judgment vpon so easy conditions. The bookes are not hard to be got, the places are easy to be found, and examined; there is no more exacted of him, but to beleewe what he sees. And in case he be a Protestant of the moderne prelatique fashion, who by an indifferency to any Religion whereunto the Apostles short Creed admitted by *Arrians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutichians, Pelagians*, may be applyed, hath little, or no regard of any Religion at all; yet to satisfy himself in point of curiosity, or Policy concerning Religion, methinks he should be desirous to try by his own experience whether men by facing about

S

with

## 116 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

with inconstancy of enterchanging opinions, and facing it out with impudency of manifest lies, and calumnies may build, and vphold an imaginary Church in the fancies of ignorant, and careles peeple. I can assure him that he shall discover in the practise of Protestant writers more admirable effects of knavery, then in the precepts and presidents of his only admired, and adored Apostle *Machiavel*. He will prefer English men in this point of wit, which he esteems the highest, before the Italians; for *Machiavel*, the sole Italian, he admires could never make such resolutions in Italy, although it was the marke he aimed at, as English Ministers have made in England. Vnles it were not the want of wit in the Minister, but the too much wit of the schollers. Perhaps *Machiavel* durst not presume to find peeple in his countrey apt to beleeeve, that of a number of Popes for many ages could be forged one monstrous man called Antichrist. He could not imagine that Italians would kill one another in good earnest, vpon hopes to destroy this imaginary Monster: nor that Tinkers, and Coblers brains could be so far past mending, that they would be cast into the fire in defence of the fond inventions of a fewlewd, and lying Apostatas: or that the folly of these brainslike Idiots would serve for a testimony to men in their wits. *Machiavel* had read as much history, as *John Foxe*, or his Dutch Maisters the Magdeburgeans, and could have made Acts, and Monuments with as many falsities, and fewer follies; yet he had a better conceit

conceit of his Nation, then to hope that such a booke should be placed in Churches by publicke authority, and stand so long by the shamles malice of some, and careles stupidity of others. He knew his countrymen had seene many peeces of ancient Architecture, that they would not be easily perswaded to pray with security in a Chappel supported by such a pillar. They had heard so much of the Bulls sacrificed to *Jupiter Capitolinus*, that it would be hard to make them beleeve that the praying before the Picture of Christ was in effect the old Idolatry of the Romans. The Crosses, and Images they had seen in the grots of the ancient Martyrs, freed them from the suspicion of superstitious Novelty. *Machiavel* knew better then Ministers the vices, and abuses of the Roman Clergy, and desired no lesse to decry, and destroy it; yet he was far from expecting, that Carters, and Catchpols, Porters, and Pedlers would be heard with patience in Italy prate Non-sence out of pulpits, and take vpon them to reforme, and pull downe Pope and Prelates; and much lesse that the successours of these should be respected as priests meerly by their wearing long coats without any evidence produced of their vocation, consecration, and Jurisdiction, besides what they received from a woeman dispensing with the very *State*, and *condition* of the Consecraters beyond all that hath bin practised, or pretended by the Vicar of Christ. He could not suspect that wary and jealous Italians would confesse their hidden sins to men who

## 118 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

had no other key of power, nor locke of Secrecy, but of a Woemans making. *Machiavel* could have forged a new Bible with false translations, and knew fullwell that destruction is caused by Division, and no better way to divide Religion in to innumerable sects then to make every mans fond faney the Judge of a falsified Rule of Religion, he had got what he sought and by contrary senses of Gods word had abolished all sense of God, and goodnes, had he thought that Italian Bibles would doe what the English have done, but being by office a Secretary, he was afraid to be proved a notorious falsary. He knew that by abusing scripture as our English translators have done both he and all those, who should conspire with him would forfeit their credit, and become infamous after so many, so grosse, so palpable discoveries of their false dealing. I shal note a few, and direct the Reader for many more to be found in *Gregory Martins* discovery of the manifold corruptions of holy scriptures by the Heretiques of our dayes, especially the English Sectaries.

In the Bible of the year 1562. cloffe vpon the time of the pretended solemne, and Canonical Consecration at *Lambeth* by imposition of hands, and other things requisite they make the Scripture speake in those termes Act. 14. v. 23. *When they had ordained Elders by Election in every Congregation*, and the same words are kept saving the Change of Congregation into *Church* in the Bible 1628. vpon this place I have two things to note first the wresting of the word

word *Chirotonia* from the Ecclesiastical to the profane sense of election by stretching forth the hand according to the use of the Atheniens, and against the interpretation of S *Hierome*, who in cap. 58. *Isai.* interprets *Chirotonia*, *Clericorum ordinatio*, not *Electio*; and against S. *Paul* 1. *Tim.* 5. v. 22. where speaking of ordination he saith, lay hands suddainely on noe man. The second, that both in those first times, and also in these later they declared by their version of Scripture their opinion concerning orders by election, and not by consecration, which includes imposition of hands. Now you shal see how the Scripture is made to speake to the tune of the Princes humour, notwithstanding they preach so lowd that all men, both Kings, and Popes must be put in tune by the sound of the letter. During King *Edward* the sixt his reigne, the onely translation of this place 1. *Petr.* 2. v. 13. which in the original Greeke is *submit yourselves unto every humane creature for the Lords sake*, whether it be to the King as excellling, or, &c. was then *submit your selues unto all manner ordinance of man whether it be to the King, as into the chiefe head, or, &c.* But vnder Q. *Eliz.* who, as *Cambden* in her life relateth, would not be called head of the Church, but supreme gouernor, *To the King as having preheminence Bible* 1577. and *To the King as superior Bible* 1579. But in King *Iames* his time, who pressed much the oath of supremacy. *To the King as supreme Bibles* 1612. 1618. Doe you not see these fawning

120 *The nullity of the Prelatique*

Parasites make sport vvith the Scripture to please their Princes?

Whilst liberty was cried downe where they should have put *he gave them power* (exusian) *to be made the sonnes of God.* Io. 2. v. 12. they place *Prerogative.* Bible 1558. but novv since liberty is come into credit, they have restored the vvord *Power* Bible 1628. Is this to follow Scripture, or rather force Scripture to follow themselves? But to be sure their wives may follow them, they make *S. Paul* vvandring about the vvorld like a *German Souldier* with his vvife behind him. 1. Cor. 9. v. 5. *Have not we power to lead about a wife being a sister* Bible 1580. and this remaines vnchanged even in the Bible 1628. and is like to remaine till Ministers be weary of their wiues. Notvvithstanding *S. Paul* a litle before c. 7. v. 8. sufficiently giveth to be vnderstood, he was not married. Notvvithstanding *S. Hiorome* interprets it, and *S. Austin* proves it to be, not wife, but woeman, and the Greeke fathers most expressely. Notvvithstanding, these very Bibles a litle before c. 7. v. 1. translate woeman, not wife vpon the same Greeke word, and without any article, or particle of difference betwixt the same word in both places, saving that it was not for their purpose to make *S. Paul* say it were good for a man not to touch a wife. Notvvithstanding that all who know Spanish, Portugues, Italian, French, Hebrew, High, or Low dutch, in which languages the same word no lesse then in Greeke signifies both woeman, and wife, are not

ignorant

ignorant that wheresoever there is no more determinative signes then in the text of *S. Paul* it is generally vnderstood for a woeman; not wife. And this their lewd humour makes them have such a spite against the ever Virgin Mother of God. They could translate (*Helcomenos*) *full of sores* Luc. 16. v. 20. speaking of Lazarus, but (*Kecharitomene*) Luc. 1. v. 28. must not be *full of grace*, but freely beloved Bible 1628. because it was spoken of the Virgin Mother, and in the margen is put *received into favour*, as if the Greeke word were capable of many senses but by no meanes, of that sense which might signify that the mother of God being a Virgin should befull of grace. So much she hath lost in the opinion of these lewd fellows vpon the prerogative of her Virginity.

After their fraud occasioned by a false pretence of ambiguity, they fall vpon downe right falsity. Where both the Greeke and Latin have 1. Cor. 11. v. 27. *Who so ever shall eat to this bread, or drinke the cup* They put, and instead of (*or*) Bible 1628. to perswade the ignorant that Catholickes gaine say the Scripture in not giving allwayes the communion vnder both kinds. But it is no marvel they should change *or* into *and* when *Beza* had changed *as* into *signifies* and the German heretiques *solum* for *soli* to make David say, *I have nothing else but sinned*, in lieu of, *To thee alone I have sinned*. Ps. 51. And Luther added the word *alone* to faith, and said it should stand in spite of all that opposed it. But what are these changes to  
the

# 111 *The Nullity the of Prelatique*

the making whole bookes Apocryphal because  
 prejudicial to their errorrs. The Machabees  
 thrust out vpon account of Purgatory, Eccle-  
 siasticus of liberty, Toby of the assistance of  
 Angels. For, as to their having bin questio-  
 ned, it is a vaine excuse, seing the Apocalyp-  
 se, no lesse questioned, is held for good be-  
 cause it serves the Ministers to foole the peo-  
 ple with the hornes of the beast planted on the  
 Popes head which would become their own  
 much better. But it is ridiculous to see these  
 petty Grammarians so Critical in the Etymo-  
 logical sense that Baptisme must be washing,  
 Priest, Elder, Beelzebub, Lord of asly, Ca-  
 tholique Vniuersal, and yet *Paradosis* must not  
 be traditions 2. Thess. 2. v. 15. but instru-  
 ctions Bible 1628. or ordinances, preachings,  
 institutions, or any thing, but what it should  
 be, yet where mention is made of reprehensi-  
 ble traditions, you shall be sure to have this  
 word to English the same *Paradosis*, as Matt.  
 15, v. 2. & 3. of the same Bible. Nay you shall  
 have Traditions where the Greeke word is  
 neyther *Paradosis*, nor any thing like: for,  
 Col. 2. v. 20. by (*Tradommatizesthe*) any one that  
 knowes the Greeke language, is rather put  
 in mind of Decrees, Doctrines, or opinions,  
 then Traditions; but to make them odious  
 they are left where any thing is spoken to their  
 commendation, although the original Gree-  
 ke deliver them in their proper word, and he-  
 re they are thrust in by head and shoulders,  
 where the Greeke hath a word very different,  
 and



and this not onely in the old Bible 1579. *are you led with traditions?* but in a later 1628. *are you burdened with Traditions?* The Greeke having no word proper to Traditions, much lesse to burdening. I wonder the translator of this late Bible was not ashamed here as in another place for 2. Cor. 6. v. 16. he puts, as he ought, *what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols*, not daring to be so impudent, as to follow the Bible 1567. *How agreeth the Temple of God with images*, being a thing known that ever the Iews Temples wanted not images. Much more of this kind, and even more shamefull profanation you may see M. Bramhall in Gregory Martin, whose authority, though you slight, yet you ought not to slight the manifold, and manifest examples he brings. Perhaps the authority of your Brethren the Puritans, whom you now, and then find occasion to flatter in your bookes, vwill be of more weight with you, or at least with others. In a petition directed to her most excellent Majesty, &c. pag. they speake in these termes. *Our translation of the Psalmes comprised in the booke of common prayer doth in addition, subtraction, and alteration differ from the truth of the Hebrew in two thousand places at least. And M. Carliele a Protestant, in his booke that Christ descended into Hell, sayth of the English translators, that they have depraved the sense, obscured the truth, deceived the ignorant.*

Now Sir I hope you vwill be pleased, or forced to take notice of the argument which be-

T

fore

124 *The Nullity of the Prelatique*

fore you passed by vinking, as if it were vnworthy to be regarded. Ministers falsify Scriptures, no wonder if they forge records. They are so deprived of conscience, and shame, that they conspire to maintaine their religion with *John Foxes* most false, and foolish stories, with most impudent falsifications of Scripture, of ancient, and moderne Authors, which any man that will take the least paines may evidently see to be wilfull, vnconscionable, vnexcusable; therefore no marvel if they give false attestations of a matter not extant in writing, and which may after so long a time have bin forgot by some, and remembered by others, who are not pressed to testify their remembrance as being a thing needles to the cause, and dangerous to their persons. You thought that as one mans yawning makes others yavvne, so your winking at this argument, would make others winke, and not marke the force of it. You hoped to perswade the Reader that you might as lawfully reject my Authors, as I yours. As if there were no difference bewixt men of true, and false dealing. Let any man judge that is acquainted with *Stapleton*, *Belarmine*, *Parsons*, *Peron*, shew in any of them such fowle, and wilfull cheating, as manifestly appeares in *Jewel*, *Morton*, *Andrews*, *Barlow*, and generally in the rest of the prime Protestant Ministers, or if he be not acquainted with our writers, let him but peruse the aforesaid *Walsingham's* search into Religion, or the *Quiet*, and sober reckoning with M. Tho-

*mas Morton*, where he shall find Protestants never more false, then in their imputation of fallood to our Authors. In whom I could never discover any wilfull corruption in defense of our Religion against heretiques, and the Author of the Treatise tending to Mitigation, a man well versed in the writings, of both sides, hath c. 12. pag. 489. long since challenged *Morton* to bring forth any *Catholicke Authors* whatsoever that wrote against Protestants since these heresies began, that hath bin taken in this impiety, I meane that hath set downe in print any such falsity, as can not be excused eyther by ignorance, oversight, negligence, error of print, translation, diversity of editions, or the like; but that it must needs be presumed that he knew the untruth, and yet would set it forth: of this kind, I say, let him shew but one example among all *Catholicke* writers of our time, and I will in my conscience greatly mistrust, and discredit the Author, whether it be another or my selfe. But if he shew me two or three in any writer of this kind I shall never be able to beleeve him more. Thus he. Certainly, if we were given to this practise, it vould have bin discovered in the innumerable citations of *Bel-larmine*, or of the Author of the Protestants Apology vvho hath collected the sayings, of all Protestant vvriters, he could possibly find. We have vsed faire dealing in the edition of Scripture, we follow, as having bin in vse many ages in the Church before these Controversies, and therefore not fraudalently chosen, much lesse falsely changed to favour our do-

doctrine, which *D. Covel* Protestant in his answer to *M. John Burges* pag 94. confesseth to have bin vsed in the Church a thousand three hundred yeares agoe; where he prefers it before others, and pag. 91. prefers amongst English translations, that vvhich comes neereft it. Which is highly commended by *Beza* in his Annot. in c. 2 Luc. v. 1. and by *Molinæus* the famous french Calvinist, is more esteemed then the translation of *Erasmus*, *Bucer*, *Bullinger*, *Tigurines*, and of *Calvin* himselfe, and all others.

To conclude, what Protestant so ever will not take the paines to confer the doctrines, and Doctors of both parties, but vwill take M. *Brambals* empty words for sound arguments, his pretermiſſions for ſolutions; his prevarication, or preſumption for a ſerious, and ſolid deſenſion, his Rhetorical Tropes for rational anſwers, his negative atteſtations about a ſmal acceſſory, for a poſitive Vindication of the principal charge made againſt his Clergy, ſcraps of Hiſtory, for Chriſtian Theology, a deceitfull appearance of long coates, and ſurpleſſes, for a ſufficient evidence of Prieſtly character, to ſuch a one, I ſay, that he neyther deſerves a more faithfull champion to reſcue him in his dangers, nor a more ſkilfull Devine to reſolve him in his doubts, nor a more lawfull Prieſt to abſolve him from his ſins.



r-  
o  
e  
e-  
n-  
ft  
n  
us  
d  
n-  
ill  
  
ill  
s,  
M.  
s,  
ri-  
id  
o-  
ut  
of  
y,  
a  
ur-  
tly  
ner  
ue  
vi-  
ore

